102 MONITOR

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

VOLUME 9
NO. 7
JULY, 1979

EPA DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR BARBARA BLUM SPEAKS BEFORE THE CONSERVATION FOUNDATION, WASHINGTON, D.C. on JUNE 21, 1979.

THE SUPREME COURT'S OPINION IN CECIL D. ANDRUS, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR v. SIERRA CLUB, 47 UNITED STATES LAW WEEK 4676 (JUNE 11, 1979)

Questions or comments on this publication should be addressed to:

Editor
102 Monitor
Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Environmental Review (A-104)
401 M Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20460
(202) 245-3006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.	Speech by Barbara Blum	1
2.	Andrus v. Sierra Club, 47 U.S.L.W. 4676 (June 11, 1979)	12
3.	State Index of EIS's Filed During June, 1979	19
4.	Agency Index of EIS's Filed During June, 1979	25
5.	102 Monthly Statement Summary for June, 1979	29
6.	Environmental Impact Statements Filed June, 1979	30
7.	Cumulative Summary for 1979	73
8.	Subscription Information	74

CLOSING REMARKS

THE HONORABLE BARBARA BLUM

DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR

THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

THE CONSERVATION FOUNDATION

WASHINGTON, D.C.

JUNE 21, 1979

There is not much unsaid or unwritten about the impact of government regulation on industrial siting. The fact is the problems are complex and contentious and the range of viewpoints, broad. Fortunately, the Foundation's preliminary study brings us one step closer to making sense out of the maze.

For two years, Doug Costle and I have aimed at making EPA part of the solution. We have insisted upon this -- even in the face of compelling evidence, including the Foundation study, which indicates pollution control is not the chief culprit.

Earlier today, Paul DeFalco, EPA Regional Administrator in San Francisco, described many of our efforts -- the major overhaul we're proposing for the permits process, our system of economic incentives to encourage pollution control and our 40-point program of regulatory reform.

We're serious about these efforts, and we want them to work.

In fact, today my intention was to bring the theme, as it applies to industrial siting, into sharper focus.

However, current events overwhelmed the text of my remarks.

A June 4 memorandum from Energy Secretary Jim Schlesinger to President Carter found its way into the public eye, and as Deputy Administrator of the Agency whose policy is challenged, I must respond.

I do so with some reluctance.

About the last thing that's needed to solve the energy crisis is another skirmish outside the main arena. However, for me to stay silent poses a greater risk.

The subject of the memo to President Carter is coal. "Without greatly expanded use of coal," Mr. Schlesinger warns, "the country may not make it." He cites four major obstacles including the Clean Air Act. The President should act, Mr. Schlesinger said, first by considering relaxation of air quality standards.

Indeed, much of the hope for this country's immediate energy future is pinned on coal. And President Carter has acted. By decontrolling the price of oil and gas, he removed the single biggest barrier to coal advancement. The President's decision not only makes direct firing of coal more attractive, but provides a tremendous boost to use of coal-derived synthetic fuels.

In advocating the use of more coal, we need not -- indeed, cannot -- advocate diminishing national policy. And that policy, set by the President and Congress, is to burn not only more coal but burn it more cleanly.

In my judgment, this is a wise course for public policy, placing priority both on our nation's energy well-being and public health. These goals are compatible. They are realistic. They reflect public concern. And what's more, they exist for good reason. To retreat from the commitment would be dead wrong -- dead wrong for government, for industry and, most of all, for the American people.

Years ago, Congress passed the Clean Air Act. Why? It was not because our Senators and Representatives are environmental extremists or anti-industrialists. Rather, after years of study and public hearings, Congress determined that dirty air threatens the health of the American people and that something must be done.

The legislation which resulted -- embodying the concept of a strong Federal-State partnership -- is sound.

In 1977, again after careful deliberation, Congress made mid-course corrections, corrections which strike a balance between environmental needs, energy and the economy.

Still, in introducing the new amendments, former Congressman Paul Rogers put it this way:

> "Events of the past 6 years have confirmed the importance of reducing air pollution where it exists and preventing it where it does not... We must continue to move forward...."

Who is Paul Rogers? At the time, he was not Chairman of a Congressional committee on energy. His primary interest was not preservation of our natural resources. His concern was public health.

And that basic concern for human health dominates our insistence on burning America's vast coal deposits as cleanly as possible.

The Clean Air Act, in part, calls for keeping clean areas clean. In tune with this, EPA so far has approved permits for 74 new coal-fired power plants. When they come on line in the early 1980's, use of coal will increase by nearly 25 percent. Permits for only two plants have been denied.

On EPA's recently-announced standard for new coal-fired power plants, let me say this. Coal will be burned in large quantities -- in some 350 new plants by 1995 -- in a way that does not harm public health or the environment. The new plants covered by this standard will be seven times cleaner than existing coal plants. Our joint analysis with the Department of Energy indicates that the effect of the standard on total coal production is negligible. Production still is expected to nearly triple by 1995. High sulfur coal can be burned, and production of locally available coal is assured.

Then there's the story of conversions -- those plants wanting to switch to coal. Of the 67 cases referred to EPA for environmental review, 46 have been completed and returned to the Department of Energy. Others will be soon. The fact is that EPA is not holding up plant conversions.

There's more.

A month ago, EPA announced another major move which will allow the first major power plant in New England to convert from foreign oil to domestic coal. It is the largest in the nation to do so. The plant, located in Somerset, Mass., expects to cut New England's dependence on imported oil by as much as 17 percent.

EPA is concerned about the price tag on pollution control, too. We want environmental protection, but we want it at the lowest possible cost. And we're putting our money where our mouth is, by helping to develop new cheaper technology and by looking at ways to make existing methods more cost-effective. A major factor, for example, in our decision on new power plants was to accept the promise of dry scrubbing, a new technology, because it would allow maximum use of low-sulfur coal at a reasonable cost.

We're concerned about unnecessary delay companies may encounter in obtaining pollution control permits. Only last week, we proposed to speed up and simplify the process -- not only under the Clean Air Act, but three other laws as well. Already, EPA has named a single point of contact in each of our 10 regional offices to coordinate the work. This -- coupled with strict new deadlines that have been set -- should reduce delay and uncertainty.

Finally, we're working closely with other agencies. At President Carter's request on April 5, EPA joined the Department of Interior and the Department of Energy in exploring ways the nation can produce and use more clean coal. We are working diligently to give the President what he asked for. We believe joint efforts like this are important to sound public policy-making, and we stand ready to do more -- on coal or any other issue.

EPA's actions are part of the picture . Their significance becomes clear when you look at the whole canvas.

Coal is on the upswing, according to most sources including the Department of Energy.

In fact, the Department projects that Secretary Schlesinger's target of 2.1 billion tons of coal annually by the year 2000 is likely to be met.

Moreover, demand for coal by utilities -- some 72 percent of the total coal market -- has been strong since 1974. Total use of coal between 1972 and 1977 rose 3.6 percent a year, despite the worst recession since the 1930's and dramatic progress by industry to conserve all forms of energy.

It is true that in 1978 the pattern of growth was disrupted by the coal strike. But overall, the trend is up, and the outlook is even more encouraging. For one thing, there are new incentives. For another, there is the very significant price advantage coal has over oil, a gap expected to widen even more in the coming decade.

Is it coal and only coal which will meet our country's energy needs for the rest of the century?

Again, some perspective is needed.

Coal is important, very important.

But the crunch we're in today involves a shortage of liquid fuels -- gasoline for cars; diesel for tractors, trucks, and other vehicles; fuel oil for heating homes and offices and for manufacturing, and heavy residual oil for generating electricity.

Coal will not fill this gap easily and sometimes not at all. Cars can't run on coal, at least yet. And millions of Americans are not about to return to burning coal in their homes and offices.

Take transportation. About half of the nation's entire supply of oil is poured into gasoline tanks. Obviously, it is imperative for American drivers to conserve and for efforts to be made so that gasoline is allocated more equitably. But just as obviously, domestic oil production must be stepped up, something the Carter Administration is earnestly trying to do.

How about heating oil? Here, we face another serious shortage, and here again, coal may not promise much relief.

Conservation measures could -- if, for example, more and more buildings were better insulated and obsolete oil burners were replaced. And while it is possible for more homes and offices to be heated by electricity generated by coal-fired power plants, many people see natural gas as a cheaper and cleaner alternative.

Quite frankly, the U.S. has lots of natural gas -- and even more will come on line as the effect of the President's decontrol policy spreads. Granted, time is needed to fully develop this energy reserve. But the American Gas Association says that now, even as we meet, natural gas could supplant 500,000 additional barrels of oil a day -- oil, in other words, which could be used to shorten the lines around gasoline stations or to defray other critical energy needs.

There are other alternatives, sometimes given short shrift.

The Western Hemisphere has a huge untapped reservoir of heavy oils. With current trends in world prices, recovery of the material, I am told, may make more and more economic sense. Nuclear power, as Secretary Schlesinger points out, may become less viable. But geothermal and other sources of energy such as solar, literally and figuratively, are on the horizon. The technology is at hand. The costs are coming down. And I have no doubt -- given serious backing by the public and private sectors -- that solar alone can meet fully 20 percent of our national energy needs by the year 2000, the goal set by President Carter only yesterday.

My bottom line is this: today the nation faces a fuel shortage, and coal, singlehandedly, cannot fill the gap. More coal, however, is critical to meet national needs, and at EPA, we are working -- with more than a little success -- to see that it happens in a way that is consistent with public health needs.

You have been patient this afternoon, listening to more about my views on energy and the environment than you probably wanted to know.

But make no mistake: More is at stake than a debate. What Jim Schlesinger, what Barbara Blum, what all of us are working toward is a situation where energy, the environment and the economy are not locked in mortal combat.

Environmental contamination at Love Canal in upstate New York reminds us that the costs of cleanup after the fact dwarf those associated with preventing the problem.

The long shadows cast by the towers at Three Mile Island, however, really bring the message home.

As a nation, we must ask -- and answer -- questions about the human side of technology, of our nation's growth and development. Unless we proceed intelligently -- insisting that material well-being is in tune with public health and safety, progress can become a noose around our throats.

No one can look into the future, anticipating with certainty the consequences of what we do or don't do today. But let Love Canal and Three Mile Island remind us that action based on limited goals or short-range gain is intolerable.

Human factors -- and the costs they imply -- must be a matter of priority at every stage of all decisionmaking, public and private.

Then add an extra measure of precaution.

After all, it's not only the present we're concerned with. It's what could be.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
722 JACKSON PLACE, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006

Memorandum For NEPA Liaisons June 28, 1979

Subject: The Supreme Court's Opinion in Andrus v. Sierra Club, ___U.S.___, 47 U.S.L.W. 4676 (June 11, 1979).

In its first opinion concerning the National Environmental Policy Act since the Council issued implementing regulations last November (40 C.F.R. Parts 1500-1508, Fed. Reg. 55978 (Nov. 29, 1978)), the Supreme Court looked largely to the standards set by the regulations for resolving the issue before it. The question raised by the case was whether an environmental impact statement was required on requests for appropriations submitted to the Congress by Federal agencies. The Council's 1973 guidelines took the position that an EIS was required. The new NEPA regulations took the opposite view.

The Supreme Court sided with CEQ's new regulations. In the Court's words, "CEQ's interpretation of NEPA is entitled to substantial deference." (Id, at 4679.) In reaching its decision, the Court stated that

> "It is true that in the past we have been somewhat less inclined to defer to 'administrative guidelines' when they have 'conflicted with earlier pronouncements of the agency.' [Citation omitted.] But CEQ's reversal of interpretation occurred during the detailed and comprehensive process ordered by the President of transforming advisory guidelines into mandatory regulations applicable to all federal agencies. [Citation omitted.] A mandatory requirement that every federal agency submit EISs with its appropriation requests raises wholly different and more serious issues 'of fair and prudent administration,' ibid., than does nonbinding advice." (Ibid.)

The question of NEPA's application to requests for appropriations is the only issue on which the Council reversed itself in the new regulations. Since the Supreme Court accorded the Council's view substantial deference in this context, other provisions of the regulations where no reversal of opinion occurred will presumably be accorded similar weight.

The Supreme Court's ruling and thoughtful opinion provide strong support for the implementation of the new NEPA regulations and for the accomplishment of the objectives of NEPA generally. The Court's opinion quotes extensively from NEPA and the regulations and adopts a positive approach to the environmental impact statement process. We encourage you to read the opinion in its entirety and to be guided by the opinion in your implementation of NEPA. The Council stands ready to be of assistance.

NICHOLAS C. YOST
General Counsel

precisely for the purpose of encouraging *private* challenges to antitrust violations. These private suits provide a significant supplement to the limited resources available to the Department of Justice for enforcing the antitrust laws and deterring violations. Indeed, nearly twenty times as many private antitrust actions are currently pending in the federal courts as actions filed by the Department of Justice. Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Court, 1978 Annual Report 78 (Table 28). To be sure, these private suits impose a heavy litigation burden on the federal courts; it is the clear responsibility of Congress to provide the judicial resources necessary to execute its mandates.

Finally, respondents argue that the cost of defending consumer class actions will have a potentially ruinous effect on small businesses in particular and will ultimately be paid by consumers in any event. These are not unimportant considerations, but they are policy considerations more properly addressed to Congress than to this Court. However accurate respondents' arguments may prove to be—and they are not without substance—they cannot govern our reading of the plain language in § 4.

District courts must be especially alert to identify frivolous claims brought to extort nuisance settlements; they have broad power and discretion vested in them by Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure with respect to matters involving the certification and management of potentially cumbersome or frivolous class actions. See generally Durham & Dibble, Certification: A Practical Device for Early Screening of Spurious Antitrust Litigation, 1978 B. Y. U. L. Rev. 299 (1978). Recognition of the plain meaning of the statutory language "business or property" need not result in administrative chaos, class action harassment, or "windfall" settlements if the district courts exercise sound discretion and use the tools available.

The judgment of the Court of Appeals is reversed, and the case is remanded for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

Reversed and remanded.

MR. JUSTICE BRENNAN took no part in the decision of this case.

MR. JUSTICE REHNQUIST, concurring.

I join the Court's opinion, and write separately only to point out that the concern expressed by the Court of Appeals that an interpretation of "business or property" in the manner in which the Court interprets it today would "add a substantial volume of litigation to the already strained dockets of the federal courts and could be used to exact unfair settlements from retail businesses," *ante*, at 3, is by no means an unfounded one. And pronouncements from this Court exhorting District Courts to be "especially alert to identify frivolous claims brought to extort nuisance settlements" will not be a complete solution for those courts which are actually on the firing line in this type of litigation. *Ante*, at 11. But I fully agree that we must take the statute as Congress wrote it, and I also fully agree with the Court's construction of the phrase "business or property." I think that the Court's observation in footnote 6, *ante*, at 10, that "the treble-damages remedy of § 4 took on new practical significance for consumers with the advent of Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 23" is a miracle of understatement; and in the absence of any jurisdictional limit, there is considerable doubt in my mind whether this type of action is indeed ultimately of primary benefit to consumers themselves, who may recover virtually no monetary damages, as opposed to the attorneys for the class, who stand to obtain handsome rewards for their services. Be that as it may, the problem, if there is one, is for Congress and not for the courts.

JOHN E. THOMAS, St. Paul, Minn., for petitioner; JOHN H. SHENEFIELD, Assistant Attorney General (WADE H. McCREE, JR., Solicitor General, FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, Deputy Solicitor General, STEPHEN M. SHAPIRO, Assistant to the Solicitor General, BARRY GROSSMAN, and BRUCE E. FEIN, Justice Department attorneys, with him on the brief) for U.S., as amicus curiae; WARREN SPANNAUS, Attorney General, State of Minnesota, for Alabama, et al., as amicus curiae; ELLIOT S. KAPLAN, Minneapolis, Minn. (JULIAN R. WILHEIM, FRED L. WOODWORTH(JOSEPH C. BASTA, DYKEMA, GOSSETT, SPENCER, GOODNOW & TRIGG, DEBORAH J. PALMER, and ROBINS, DAVIS & LYONS, with him on the brief) for respondents.

No. 78-625

Cecil D. Andrus, Secretary of the Interior, et al., Petitioners,
v.
Sierra Club et al.

On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit,

[June 11, 1979]

Syllabus

Section 102 (2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) requires environmental impact statements (EIS's) to be included in recommendations or reports of federal agencies on "proposals for legislation and other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment." Contending that § 102 (2)(C) requires federal agencies to prepare EIS's to accompany appropriation requests, respondents, three organizations with interests in the preservation of the environment, brought suit in Federal District Court against petitioners, the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Respondents alleged that proposed curtailments in the budget of the National Wildlife Refuge System would significantly affect the quality of the human environment, and hence should have been accompanied by an EIS prepared by both the Department of the Interior's Fish and Wildlife Service, which administers the Refuge System, and by OMB. The District Court granted summary judgment for respondents and ordered petitioners to prepare EIS's on annual proposals for financing the Refuge System. The District Court's holding was modified by the Court of Appeals, which concluded that while § 102 (2)(C) has no application to a routine appropriation request for continuance of an ongoing program, an EIS is required when an appropriation request accompanies a proposal for taking new action that significantly changes the status quo, or when the request "ushers in a considered programmatic course following a programmatic review."

Held: Section 102 (2)(C) does not require federal agencies to prepare EIS's to accompany appropriation requests.

(a) Appropriation requests, even those which are the result of an agency's "painstaking review" of an ongoing program, are not "proposals for legislation" within the meaning of § 102 (2)(C). NEPA makes no distinction between "proposals for legislation" that are the result of "painstaking review," and those that are merely "routine"; and the interpretation of NEPA by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) under its current mandatory regulations which specify that "legislation" does not include appropriation requests, is entitled to substantial deference even though the regulations reverse CEQ's interpretation under earlier advisory guidelines that were in effect at the time of the Court of Appeals' decision. Moreover, CEQ's current interpretation is consistent with the traditional distinction which Congress has drawn between "legislation" and "appropriation," the rules of both Houses prohibiting "legislation" from being added to an appropriation bill.

(b) Nor do appropriation requests constitute "proposals for . . . major Federal actions" for purposes of § 102 (2)(C). Appropriation requests do not "propose" federal actions at all, but instead fund actions already proposed. Thus, § 102 (2)(C) is best interpreted as applying to those recommendations or reports that actually propose programmatic actions, rather than to those which merely suggest how such actions may be funded. Even if changes in agency programs occur *because* of budgetary decisions, an EIS at the appropriation stage would only be repetitive of the EIS that must accompany any proposed changes in the agency's programs that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

581 F. 2d 895, reversed.

Brennan, J., delivered the opinion for a unanimous Court.

Mr. Justice Brennan delivered the opinion of the Court.

The question for decision is whether § 102 (2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 83 Stat. 852, 42 U. S. C. § 4332 (2)(C), requires federal agencies to prepare environmental impact statements (EISs) to accompany appropriation requests. We hold that it does not.

I

NEPA sets forth its purposes in bold strokes:

> "The purposes of this Act are: To declare a national policy which will encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment; to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man; to enrich the understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to the Nation. . . ." 42 U. S. C. § 4321.[1]

Congress recognized, however, that these desired goals could be incorporated into the everyday functioning of the Federal Government only with great difficulty. See S. Rep. No. 91-296, p. 19 (1969). NEPA therefore contains "action-forcing procedures which will help to insure that the policies [of the Act] are implemented." *Ibid.* See *Kleppe* v. *Sierra Club*, 427 U. S. 390, 409 (1976). Section 102 (2)(C) of the Act sets out one of these procedures:

> "The Congress authorizes and directs that, to the fullest extent possible . . . (2) all agencies of the Federal Government shall—
>
> . . . . .
>
> "(C) include in every recommendation or report *on proposals for legislation and other major Federal actions* significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a detailed statement by the responsible official on—
>
> "(i) the environmental impact of the proposed action,
>
> "(ii) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented,
>
> "(iii) alternatives to the proposed action,
>
> "(iv) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and
>
> "(v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented." 42 U. S. C. § 4332 (2)(C) (emphasis supplied).

The thrust of § 102 (2)(C) is thus that environmental concerns be integrated into the very process of agency decisionmaking. The "detailed statement" it requires is the outward sign that environmental values and consequences have been considered during the planning stage of agency actions.[2] If environmental concerns are not interwoven into the fabric of agency planning, the "action-forcing" characteristics of § 102 (2)(C) would be lost. "In the past, environmental factors have frequently been ignored and omitted from consideration in the early stages of planning. . . . As a result, unless the results of planning are radically reversed at the policy level—and this often means the Congress—environmental enhancement opportunities may be foregone and unnecessary degradation incurred." S. Rep. No. 91-296, *supra*, at 20. For this reason the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) require federal agencies to "integrate the NEPA process with other planning at the earliest possible time to insure that planning and decisions reflect environmental values. . . ." 43 Fed. Reg. 55992 (1978) (to be codified, at 40 CFR § 1501.2).[3]

In 1974 respondents, three organizations with interests in the preservation of the environment,[4] brought suit in Federal District Court for the District of Columbia alleging that § 102 (2)(C) requires federal agencies to prepare environmental impact statements[5] to accompany their appropriation requests. Respondents named as defendants the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). and alleged that proposed curtailments in the budget of the National Wildlife Refuge Systems (NWRS), 80 Stat. 926, 16 U. S. C. § 668dd. would "cut back significantly the operations, maintenance, and staffing of units within the

---

[1] Section 101 (b) articulates these purposes with even greater particularity:

"In order to carry out the policy set forth in this Act, it is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means, consistent with other essential considerations of national policy, to improve and coordinate Federal plans, functions, programs, and resources to the end that the Nation may—

"(1) fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations;

"(2) assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and esthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings;

"(3) attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences;

"(4) preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity, and variety of individual choice;

"(5) achieve a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities; and

"(6) enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources." 42 U. S. C. § 4331 (b).

[2] Of course an EIS need not be promulgated unless an agency's planning ripens into a "recommendation or report on proposals for legislation [or] other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment." See *Kleppe* v. *Sierra Club*, 427 U. S. 390 (1976). Moreover, although NEPA requires compliance "to the fullest extent possible," we have held that the duty to prepare an EIS must yield before "a clear and unavoidable conflict in statutory authority." *Flint Ridge Development Co.* v. *Scenic Rivers Assn.*, 426 U. S. 776, 788 (1976).

[3] CEQ regulations state that "[t]he primary purpose of an environmental impact statement is to serve as an action-forcing device to insure that the policies and goals defined in [NEPA] are infused into the ongoing programs and actions of the Federal Government. . . . An environmental impact statement is more than a disclosure document. It shall be used by Federal officials in conjunction with other relevant material to plan actions and make decisions." 43 Fed. Reg. 55994 (to be codified, at 40 CFR § 1502.1).

In Executive Order No. 11991, President Carter required the CEQ to issue regulations that included procedures "for the early preparation of environmental impact statements." 3 CFR 124 (1977 Comp.). As a consequence, CEQ regulations provide:

"An agency shall commence preparation of an environmental impact statement as close as possible to the time the agency is developing or is presented with a proposal so that preparation can be completed in time for the final statement to be included in any recommendation or report on the proposal. The statement shall be prepared early enough so that it can serve practically as an important contribution to the decisionmaking process and will not be used to rationalize or justify decisions already made. For instance:

"(a) For projects directly undertaken by Federal agencies the environmental impact statement shall be prepared at the feasibility analysis (go-no go) stage and may be supplemented at a later stage if necessary. . . ." 43 Fed. Reg. 55995 (to be codified, at 40 CFR § 1502.5).

[4] Respondents are the Sierra Club, the National Parks and Conservation Association, and the Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.

[5] CEQ regulations define an "environmental impact statement" to mean "a detailed written statement as required by Sec. 102 (2)(C) of [NEPA]." 43 Fed. Reg. 56004 (to be codified, at 40 CFR § 1508.11).

System."[6] Complaint ¶ 17. The System is administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior and consists of more than 350 refuges encompassing more than 30 million acres in 49 States. The primary purpose of the NWRS is to provide a national program "for the restoration, preservation, development and management of wildlife and wildlands habitat; for the protection and preservation of endangered or threatened species and their habitat; and for the management of wildlife and wildlands to obtain the maximum benefits from these resources." 50 CFR § 25.11 (b) (1978).[7] Respondents alleged that the proposed budget curtailments would significantly affect the quality of the human environment,[8] and hence should have been accompanied by an EIS prepared by both the Fish and Wildlife Service and by the Office of Management and Budget.[9]

The District Court agreed with respondents' contentions. Relying on provisions of the then applicable CEQ guidelines,[10] and on the Department of the Interior's Manual,[11] the District Court held that "appropriation requests are 'proposals for legislation' within the meaning of NEPA," and also that "annual proposals for financing the Refuge System are major Federal actions which clearly have a significant effect on the environment." *Sierra Club* v. *Morton*, 395 F. Supp. 1187, 1188, 1189 (DC 1975). The District Court granted respondents' motion for summary judgment, and provided declaratory and injunctive relief. It stated that the Department of the Interior and OMB were required "to prepare, consider, and disseminate environmental impact statements on annual proposals for financing the National Wildlife Refuge System."[12] Pet. for Cert. 16a.

The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit modified the holding of the District Court. The Court of Appeals was apprehensive because "[a] rule requiring preparation of an EIS on the annual budget request for virtually every ongoing program would trivialize NEPA." — U. S. App. D. C. —, —, 581 F. 2d 895, 903 (1978). Therefore the Court of Appeals concluded that § 102 (2)(C) required the preparation of an EIS only when an appropriation request accompanies "a 'proposal' for taking new action which significantly changes the status quo," or when "the request for budget approval and appropriations is one that ushers in a considered programmatic course following a programmatic review." *Ibid.* Section 102 (2)(C) would thus have no application to "a routine request for budget approval and appropriations for continuance and management of an ongoing program." *Ibid.* The Court of Appeals held, however, that there was no need for injunctive relief because the Fish and Wildlife Service had completed during the pendancy of the appeal a "Programmatic EIS" that adequately evaluated the environmental consequences for the NWRS of various budgetary alternatives.[13] — U. S. App. D. C., at —; 581 F. 2d, at 904. See United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Final Environmental Statement: Operation of the National Wildlife Refuge System (Nov. 1976).[14]

We granted certiorari, — U. S. — (1978), and we now reverse.

II

NEPA requires EISs to be included in recommendations or reports on both "proposals for legislation . . . significantly affecting the quality of the human environment" and "proposals for . . . major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment." 42 U. S. C. § 4332 (2)(C). See CEQ regulations, 43 Fed. Reg. 56001 (to be codified at 40 CFR § 1506.8 (a)). Petitioners argue, however, that the requirements of § 102 (2)(C) have no application to the budget process. The contrary holding of the Court of Appeals rests on two alternative interpretations of § 102 (2)(C). The first is that appropriation requests which are the result of "an agency's painstaking review of an ongoing program," — U. S. App. D. C., at —, 581 F. 2d, at 903, are "proposals for legislation" within the meaning of § 102 (2)(C). The second is that appropriation requests which are the reflection of "new" agency initiatives constituting "major Federal actions" under NEPA, are themselves "proposals for . . . major Federal actions" for purposes of § 102 (2)(C). We hold that neither interpretation is correct.

A

We note initially that NEPA makes no distinction between "proposals for legislation" that are the result of "painstaking review," and those that are merely "routine." When Congress has thus spoken "in the plainest of words." *Tennessee Valley Authority* v. *Hill*, 437 U. S. 153, 194 (1978), we will ordinarily decline to fracture the clear language of a statute, even for the purpose of fashioning from the resuling fragments a rule that "accords with 'common sense and the public weal.'" *Id.*, at 195. Therefore either all appropriation requests constitute "proposals for legislation," or none does.

---

[6] See United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Final Environmental Statement: Operation of the National Wildlife Refuge System, I-6—I-9 (Nov. 1976).

[7] The System is administered according to the provisions of several statutes. The most significant of these are the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1934, 48 Stat. 401, 72 Stat. 563, 16 U. S. C. § 661 *et seq.*; the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, 70 Stat. 1119, 16 U. S. C. § 742a *et seq.*; the Migratory Bird Conservation Act, 45 Stat. 1222, 16 U. S. C. § 715 *et seq.*; and the Endangered Species Act of 1973, 87 Stat. 884, 16 U. S. C. § 1531 *et seq.*

[8] Respondents brought suit on behalf of themselves, claiming that they had organizational interests in monitoring and publicizing the management of the NWRS, and on behalf of their members, alleging that the latter used the NWRS for recreational and other purposes and would be affected by the proposed budget curtailments.

[9] Respondents alleged that OMB had "significantly reduced the Interior Department's request for appropriations for the operation of the National Wildlife Refuge System during fiscal year 1974 and during other years without preparing or considering the environmental-impact statement required by NEPA." Complain ¶ 25.

Respondents also contended that § 102 (2)(B) of NEPA required OMB to develop procedures to assure consideration of environmental factors in the budget process. Section 102 (2)(B) requires all federal agencies to "identify and develop methods and procedures, in consultation with the Council on Environmental Quality established by title II of this Act, which will insure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration in decisionmaking along with economic and technical considerations." 42 U. S. C. § 4332 (2)(B).

[10] At that time CEQ was authorised by Executive Order No. 11514, § 3 (h), to issue nonbinding "guidelines to Federal agencies for the preparation of detailed statements on proposals for legislation and other Federal actions affecting the environment." 3 CFR 904 (1966–1970 Comp.). These guidelines stated that the "major Federal actions" to which § 102 (2)(C) applied included "[r]ecommendations or favorable reports relating to legislation including requests for appropriations." 40 CFR § 1500.5 (a)(1) (1974). See *id.*, at § 1500.3.

[11] At that time the Department of the Interior's Manual, following CEQ's proposed guidelines, provided:

"The following criteria are to be used in deciding whether a proposed action requires the preparation of an environmental statement:

"A Types of Federal actions to be considered include, but are not limited to:

"(1) Recommendations or favorable reports to the Congress relating to legislation, including appropriations." Department of the Interior Manual, § 516.5, 36 Fed. Reg. 19344 (1971).

[12] Without additional discussion, the District Court also stated that the Director of OMB was required "to develop formal mehods and procedures which will, with respect to [OMB]'s own administrative actions and proposals, identify those agency actions requiring environmental statements to be prepared, considered, and disseminated." Pet. for Cert. 62a. See n. 9, *supra*.

[13] Respondents do not now challenge this holding.

[14] The Court of Appeals also affirmed what it took to be the District Court's declaratory relief requiring OMB "to adopt procedures and appropriate regulations to comply with the obligations NEPA imposes on the budget process . . . ." — U. S. App. D. C., at —, 581 F. 2d, at 905. See n. 12, *supra*.

There is no direct evidence in the legislative history of NEPA that enlightens whether Congress intended the phrase "proposals for legislation" to include requests for appropriations. At the time of the Court of Appeals' decision, however, CEQ guidelines provided that § 102 (2)(C) applied to "[r]ecommendations or favorable reports relating to legislation including requests for appropriations." 40 CFR § 1500.5 (a)(1) (1977).[15] At that time CEQ's guidelines were advisory in nature, and were for the purpose of assisting federal agencies in complying with NEPA. *Id.*, at § 1500.1 (a).

In 1977, however, President Carter, in order to create a single set of uniform, mandatory regulations, ordered CEQ, "after consultation with affected agencies," to "[i]ssue regulations to Federal agencies for the implementation of the procedural provisions" of NEPA. Executive Order No. 11991, § 1, 3 CFR 124 (1977 Comp.). The President ordered the heads of federal agencies to "comply with the regulations issued by the Council . . . ." *Id.*, at § 2. CEQ has since issued these regulations, 43 Fed. Reg. 55978-56007 (1978),[16] and they reverse CEQ's prior interpretation of § 101 (2)(C). The regulations provide specifically that "'[l]egislation' includes a bill or legislative proposal to Congress . . . but does *not* include requests for appropriations." 43 Fed. Reg. 56004 (to be codified, at 40 CFR § 1508.17). (Emphasis supplied.) CEQ explained this reversal by noting that, on the basis of "traditional concepts relating to appropriations and the budget cycle, considerations of timing and confidentiality, and other factors. . . . the Council in its experience found that preparation of EISs is ill-suited to the budget preparation process." [17] *Id.*, at 55989.

CEQ's interpretation of NEPA is entitled to substantial deference. See *Warm Springs Dam Task Force* v. *Gribble*, 417 U. S. 1301, 1309-1310 (1974) (Douglas, Circuit Justice). The Council was created by NEPA, and charged in that statute with the responsibility "to review and appraise various programs and activities of the Federal Government in the light of the policy set forth in this Act . . . , and to make recommendations to the President with respect thereto." 42 U. S. C. § 4344 (3).

It is true that in the past we have been somewhat less inclined to defer to "administrative guidelines" when they have "conflicted with earlier pronouncements of the agency." *General Electric Co.* v. *Gilbert*, 429 U. S. 125, 143 (1976). But CEQ's reversal of interpretation occurred during the detailed and comprehensive process, ordered by the President, of transforming advisory guidelines into mandatory regulations applicable to all federal agencies. See *American Trucking Associations, Inc.* v. *Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe R. Co.*, 387 U. S. 397, 416 (1967). A mandatory requirement that every federal agency submit EISs with its appropriation requests raises wholly different and more serious issues "of fair and prudent administration," *ibid.*, than does nonbinding advice. This is particularly true in light of the Court of Appeal's correct observation that "[a] rule requiring preparation of an EIS on the annual budget request for virtually every ongoing program would trivialize NEPA." — U. S. App. D. C., at —, 581 F. 2d, at 903. The Court of Appeals accurately noted that such an interpretation of NEPA would be a "*reductio ad absurdum*. . . . It would be absurd to require an EIS on every decision on the management of federal land, such as fluctuation in the number of forest fire spotters." *Id.*, at —, 581 F. 2d, at 902. Even respondents do not now contend that NEPA should be construed so that all appropriation requests constitute "proposals for legislation." Brief for Respondents 13 n. 6, 55-61.

CEQ's interpretation of the phrase "proposals for legislation" is consistent with the traditional distinction which Congress has drawn between "legislation" and "appropriation."[18] The rules of both Houses "prohibit 'legislation'

---

[15] CEQ had taken this position from the first draft of its guidelines. CEQ was required by President Nixon to issue guidelines on March 5, 1970. See Executive Order No. 11514, 3 CFR 902 (1966-1970 Comp.). On April 30, 1970, CEQ promulgated interim guidelines which provided that "major Federal actions" included "[r]ecommendations or reports relating to legislation and appropriations." Council on Environmental Quality, First Annual Report: Environmental Quality 288 (1970). On April 23, 1971, the guidelines were revised to state that "major Federal actions" included "[r]ecommendations or favorable reports relating to legislation including that for appropriations." 36 Fed. Reg. 7724 (1971). On August 1, 1973, the guidelines were once again revised, this time to the form noted by the Court of Appeals. 38 Fed. Reg. 20551 (1973).

Relying on the CEQ guidelines, two prior decisions by Courts of Appeals have both interpreted "proposals for legislation" to include appropriations requests. See *Environmental Defense Fund* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority*, 468 F. 2d 1164, 1181 (CA6 1972); *Scientists' Institute for Public Information, Inc.* v. *Atomic Energy Comm'n*, — U. S. App. D. C. —, —, 481 F. 2d 1079, 1088 (1973).

[16] These regulations become effective July 30, 1979. 43 Fed. Reg. 55978.

[17] The CEQ also noted that "[n]othing in the Council's determination, however, relieves agencies of responsibility to prepare statements when otherwise required on the underlying program or other actions." 43 Fed. Reg. 55989.

[18] The Congressional Budget Act of 1974 directs the Comptroller General of the United States, "in cooperation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, [to] develop, establish, maintain, and publish standard terminology, definitions, classifications, and codes for Federal fiscal, budgetary, and program-related data and information." 88 Stat. 327, 31 U. S. C. § 1152 (a)(1). Pursuant to this statutory authority, the Comptroller General has published definitions distinguishing "authorizing legislation" from "appropriation." *Authorizing legislation* is defined in the following manner:

> "Basic substantive legislation enacted by Congress which sets up or continues the legal operation of a Federal program or agency either indefinitely or for a specific period of time or sanctions a particular type of obligation or expenditure within a program. Such legislation is normally a prerequisite for subsequent appropriations or other kinds of budget authority to be contained in appropriations acts. It may limit the amount of budget authority to be provided subsequently or may authorise the appropriation of 'such sums as may be necessary.'" Terms Used in the Budgetary Process 4 (July 1977).

Appropriation, on the other hand, is defined as:

> "An authorization by an act of the Congress that permits Federal agencies to incur obligations and to make payments out of the Treasury for specified purposes. An appropriation usually follows enactment of authorizing legislation. . . . Appropriations do not represent cash actually set aside in the Treasury for purposes specified in the appropriation act; they represent limitations of amounts which agencies may obligate during the time period specified in the respective appropriations acts." *Id.*, at 3.

Congressional enactments employ this distinction between appropriation and legislation. For example, the Budget and Accounting Act requires the President to include in the proposed budget he submits to Congress

> "with respect to each proposal in the Budget for new or additional *legislation* which would create or expand any function, activity, or authority, in addition to those functions, activities, and authorities then existing or as then being administered and operated, a tabulation showing—
>
> "(A) the amount proposed in the Budget for *appropriation* and for expenditure in the ensuing fiscal year on account of such proposal; and
>
> "(B) the estimated *appropriation* required on account of such proposal in each of the four fiscal years, immediately following that ensuing fiscal year, during which such proposal is to be in effect. . . ." 31 U. S. C. § 11 (a)(12) (emphasis supplied).

See also 18 U. S. C. § 1913; 22 U. S. C. § 2394 (c).

The Executive Branch also recognizes the distinction between appropriafrom being added to an appropriation bill." L. Fisher, Budget Concepts and Terminology: The Appropriations Phase, in I Studies in Taxation, Public Finance and Related Subjects—A Compendium 437 (Fund for Public Policy Research 1977). See Standing Rules of the United States Senate, Rule 16 (4) ("No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill . . . ."); Rules of the House of Representatives, Rule XXI (2);[19] 7 Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives §§ 1172, 1410, 1443, 1445, 1448, 1459, 1463, 1470, 1472 (1935). The distinction is maintained "to assure that program and financial matters are considered independently of one another. This division of labor is intended to enable the Appropriations Committees to concentrate on financial issues and to prevent them from transpassing on substantive legislation." House Committee on the Budget, Congressional Control of Expenditures 19 (Committee Print 1977). House and Senate rules thus require a "previous choice of policy . . . before any item of appropriations might be included in a general appropriations bill." *United States ex rel. Chapman* v. *Federal Power Commission*, 345 U. S. 153, 164 n. 5 (1953). Since appropriations therefore "have the limited and specific purpose of providing funds for authorized programs," *Tennessee Valley Authority* v. *Hill*, *supra*, at 190, and since the "action-forcing" provisions of NEPA are directed precisely at the processes of "planning and . . . decisionmaking," 42 U. S. C. § 4332 (2)(A), which are associated with underlying legislation, we conclude that the distinction made by CEQ's regulations is correct and that "proposals for legislation" do not include appropriation requests.

B

The Court of Appeals' alternative interpretation of NEPA is that appropriation requests constitute "proposals for . . . major Federal actions."[20] But this interpretation distorts the language of the Act, since appropriation requests do not "propose" federal actions at all; they instead fund actions already proposed. Section 102 (2)(C) is thus best interpreted as applying to those recommendations or reports that actually propose programmatic actions, rather than to those which merely suggest how such actions may be funded. Any other result would create unnecessary redundancy. For example, if the mere funding of otherwise unaltered agency programs were construed to constitute major federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, the resulting EISs would merely recapitulate the EISs that should have accompanied the initial proposals of the programs. And if an agency program were to be expanded or revised in a manner that constituted major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment,[21] an EIS would have been required to accompany the underlying programmatic decision.[22] An additional EIS at the appropriation stage would add nothing.

Even if changes in agency programs occur *because* of budgetary decisions, an EIS at the appropriation stage would only be repetitive. For example, respondents allege in their complaint that OMB required the Fish and Wildlife Service to decrease its appropriation request for the NWRS, and that this decrease would alter the operation of the NWRS in a manner that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment. See n. 9, *supra*. But since the Fish and Wildlife Service could respond to OMB's budgetary curtailments in a variety of ways, see United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Final Environmental Statement: Operation of the National Wildlife Refuge System (Nov. 1976), it is impossible to predict whether or how any particular budget cut will in fact significantly affect the quality of the human environment. OMB's determination to cut the Service's budget is not a programmatic proposal, and therefore requiring OMB to include an EIS in its budgetary cuts would be premature. See *Aberdeen & Rockfish R. Co.* v. *Students Challenging Regulatory Agency Procedures*, 422 U. S. 289, 320 (1975). And since an EIS must be prepared if any of the revisions the Fish and Wildlife Service proposes in its ongoing programs in response to OMB's budget cuts would significantly

---

tion and legislation. For example, OMB distinguishes its function "[t]o supervise and control the administration of the budget" from its task of assisting "the President by clearing and coordinating departmental advice on proposed legislation." Requiring Confirmation of Future Appointments of the Director and Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, H. R. Rep. No. 93-697, p. 18 (1973). See Neustadt, Presidency and Legislation: The Growth of Central Clearance, 48 Am. Pol. Sci. R. 641 (1954). OMB Circular No. A-19 (1972) establishes OMB's procedures for "legislative coordination and clearance," whereas OMB Circular No. A-11 (1978) sets out OMB's guidelines for the "preparation and submission of budget estimates." OMB Circular No. A-19 requires each federal agency to "prepare and submit to OMB annually its proposed legislative program for the next session of Congress. These programs must be submitted at the same time as the initial submissions of an agency's annual budget request as required by OMB Circular A-11." *Id.*, at § 6 (a). OMB Circular A-11, on the other hand, provides:

"If, in addition to the regular appropriation requests, it appears probable that proposals for *new legislation* may require a further budget request or result in a change in revenues or outlays, a tentative forecast of the supplemental estimate will be set forth separately. Such proposed supplementals must be consistent with items appearing in the agency's legislative program as required by OMB Circular No. A-19 . . . ." *Id.*, at § 13.2.

[19] Deschler's Procedure in the United States House of Representatives (1977) states that "[l]anguage in an appropriation bill changing existing law is legislation and not in order." *Id.*, at § 26-1.2. Conversely, "[r]estrictions against the inclusion of appropriations in legislative bills are provided for by House rule . . . ." *Id.*, at § 25-3.1.

[20] CEQ regulations define "major Federal action" in the following manner:

"'Major Federal action' includes actions with effects that may be major and which are potentially subject to Federal control and responsibility. Major reinforces but does not have a meaning independent of significantly. Actions include the circumstance where the responsible officials fail to act and that failure to act is reviewable by courts or administrative tribunals under the Administrative Procedure Act or other applicable law as agency action.

"(a) Actions include new and continuing activities, including projects and programs entirely or partly financed, assisted, conducted, regulated, or approved by federal agencies; new or revised agency rules, regulations, plans, policies, or procedures; and legislative proposals . . . .

"(b) Federal actions tend to fall within one of the following categories:

"(1) Adoption of official policy, such as rules, regulations, and interpretations adopted pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U. S. C. 551 et seq.; treaties and international conventions or agreements; formal documents establishing an agency's policies which will result in or substantially alter agency programs.

"(2) Adoption of formal plans, such as official documents prepared or approved by federal agencies which guide or prescribe alternative uses of federal resources, upon which future agency actions will be based.

"(3) Adoption of programs, such as a group of concerted actions to implement a specific policy or plan; systematic and connected agency decisions allocating agency resources to implement a specific statutory program or executive directive.

"(4) Approval of specific projects, such as construction or management activities located in a defined geographic area. Projects include actions approved by permit or other regulatory decision as well as federal and federally assisted activities." 43 Fed. Reg. 56004-56005 (to be codified, at 40 CFR § 1508.18).

[21] "[M]ajor Federal actions" include the "expansion or revision of ongoing programs." S. Rep. No. 91-296, *supra*, at 20.

[22] For example, if an agency were to seek an appropriation to initiate a major new program that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment, or if it were to decline to ask for funding so as to terminate a program with a similar effect, the agency would have been required to include EISs in the recommendations or reports on the proposed underlying programmatic decisions.

affect the quality of the human environment, requiring the Fish and Wildlife Service to include an EIS with its revised appropriation request would merely be redundant. Moreover, this redundancy would have the deleterious effect of circumventing and eliminating the careful distinction Congress has maintained between appropriation and legislation. It would flood House and Senate Appropriations Committees with EISs focused on the policy issues raised by underlying authorization legislation,[33] thereby dismantling the "division of labor" so deliberately created by congressional rules.

C

We conclude therefore, for the reasons given above, that appropriation requests constitute neither "proposals for legislation" nor "proposals for . . . major Federal actions," and that therefore the procedural requirements of § 102 (2)(C) have no application to such requests.[34] The judgment of the Court of Appeals is reversed.

So ordered.

JOHN M. HARMON, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel (LAWRENCE G. WALLACE, Acting Solicitor General, SANFORD SAGALKIN, Acting Assistant Attorney General, STEPHEN R. BARNETT, Deputy Solicitor General, KENT L. JONES, Assistant to the Solicitor General, PETER R. STEENLAND, JR., RAYMOND N. ZAGONE, DIRK D. SNIEL, Justice Department attorneys, WILLIAM M. NICHOLS, General Counsel, and RICHARD M. IRBY, with him on the brief) for petitioners; JAMES H. COHEN, Washington, D. C. (BRUCE J. TERRIS and PHILIP G. SUNDERLAND, with him on the brief) for respondents.

---

[33] The Court of Appeals held that EISs need be included in appropriation requests for "major Federal actions" only if major changes that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment are proposed in the underlying programs for which funding is sought. See — U. S. App. D. C., at —, 581 F. 2d, at 903. But an appropriation request applies not only to major changes in a federal program, but to the entire program it is designed to fund. Without appropriations, the underlying program would cease to exist. Therefore, if the existence *vel non* of that program is a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, the Court of Appeals' alternative interpretation of NEPA would require an EIS to be included in the concommitant appropriation request.

It is important to note that CEQ regulations provide that the adjective "major" in the phrase "major Federal actions" "reinforces but does not have a meaning independent of [the adverb] significantly" in the phrase "significantly affecting the quality of the human environment." 43 Fed. Reg. 56004 (to be codified, at 40 CFR § 1506.18). See n. 20, *supra*. As a consequence, the Court of Appeals' holding that certain appropriation requests are "proposals for . . . major Federal actions" is operationally identical to its holding that certain appropriation requests constitute "proposals for legislation." Both holdings would require EISs to accompany funding requests for every federal program that significantly affects the quality of the human environment. Thus not only do both holdings run the same dangers of "trivializing" NEPA, but also the same "traditional concepts relating to appropriations and the budget cycle, considerations of timing and confidentiality," 43 Fed. Reg. 55989, which led CEQ to distinguish "appropriations" from "legislation," would require appropriations to be distinguished from "proposals for . . . major Federal actions."

[34] Because we conclude that § 102 (2)(C) has no application to appropriation requests, it is clear that the Court of Appeals was incorrect in requiring OMB "to adopt procedures and appropriate regulations to comply with the obligations NEPA imposes on the budget process . . . ." — U. S. App. D. C., at —, 581 F. 2d, at 905. See n. 14, *supra*.

No. 78-753

Great American Federal Savings & Loan Association et al.,
Petitioners,
v.
John R. Novotny.

On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

[June 11, 1979]

Syllabus

After respondent, a former officer, director, and loan officer of petitioner Great American Federal Savings & Loan Association (Association) received a right-to-sue letter upon filing a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, he brought this suit against the Association and its directors in Federal District Court, alleging that the Association had intentionally embarked upon a course of conduct the effect of which was to deny to female employees equal employment opportunity; that when respondent expressed support for the female employees at a meeting of the board of directors, his connection with the Association abruptly ended; and that his support for the female employees was the cause of the termination of his employment. Respondent claimed damages under 42 U. S. C. § 1985 (c) (the surviving version of § 2 of the Civil Rights Act of 1871), contending that he had been injured as the result of a conspiracy to deprive him of equal protection of, and equal privileges and immunities under, the laws. Section 1985 (c) provides, *inter alia*, that a person so injured may have an action for damages against any one or more of the conspirators. The District Court granted petitioners' motion to dismiss, holding that § 1985 (c) could not be invoked because the directors of a single corporation cannot, as a matter of law and fact, engage in a conspiracy. The Court of Appeals reversed, holding that conspiracies motivated by an invidious animus against women fall within § 1985 (c), and that respondent, a male allegedly injured as a result of such a conspiracy, has standing to bring suit under that provision. The court further ruled that Title VII can be the source of a right asserted in a § 1985 (c) action, and that intracorporate conspiracies come within the intendment of the section.

Held: Section 1985 (c) may not be invoked to redress violations of Title VII. It creates no substantive rights itself but is a purely remedial statute, providing a civil cause of action when some otherwise defined federal right—to equal protection of the laws or equal privileges and immunities under the laws—is breached by a conspiracy in the manner defined by the section. Thus, the question in this case is whether rights created by Title VII—respondent alleged that he was injured by a conspiracy to violate § 704 (a) of Title VII, which makes it an unlawful employment practice for an employer to discriminate against an employee because he has opposed any employment practice made unlawful by Title VII or because he has participated in an investigation or proceeding under Title VII—may be asserted within the *remedial* framework of § 1985 (c). If a violation of Title VII could be asserted through § 1985 (c), a complainant could avoid most if not all of the detailed and specific provisions of Title VII, which provides a comprehensive plan of administrative and judicial process designed to provide an opportunity for nonjudicial and nonadversary resolution of claims. Perhaps most importantly, the complainant could completely bypass the administrative process, which plays such a crucial role in the scheme established by Congress in Title VII. Unimpaired effectiveness can be given to the plan of Title VII only by holding that deprivation of a right created by Title VII cannot be the basis for a cause of action under § 1985 (c). Cf. *Brown* v. *GSA*, 425 U. S. 820.

584 F. 2d 1235, vacated and remanded.

STEWART, J., delivered the opinion of the Court, in which BURGER, C. J., and BLACKMUN, POWELL, REHNQUIST, and STEVENS, JJ., joined. POWELL and STEVENS, JJ., filed concurring opinions. WHITE, J., filed a dissenting opinion, in which BRENNAN and MARSHALL, JJ., joined.

MR. JUSTICE STEWART delivered the opinion of the Court.

More than a century after their passage, the Civil Rights Acts of the Reconstruction era continue to present difficult problems of statutory construction. Cf. *Chapman* v. *Houston Welfare Rights Org.*, — U. S. —. In the case now before us, we consider the scope of 42 U. S. C. § 1985 (c), the surviving version of § 2 of the Civil Rights Act of 1871.[1]

---

[1] 42 U. S. C. § 1985 (c), Rev. Stat. § 1980, provides:

"If two or more persons in any State or Territory conspire or go in disguise on the highway or on the premises of another, for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly, any person or class of persons of the equal protection of the laws; or of equal privileges and immunities under the laws, or for the purpose of preventing or hindering the constituted authorities of any State or Territory from giving or securing to all persons within such State or Territory the equal protection of the laws; or if two or more persons conspire to prevent by force, intimidation, or threat, any citizen

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONM
JUNE 1979
STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - B

STATE	COUNTY	STATUS	STATEME
POLICY		DRAFT	SINGLE FAMILY CONSTR
ALABAMA	SEVERAL	DRAFT	WALTER F. GEORGE LAK
	TALLAPOOSA	DRAFT	HIGH SERVICE TRANSMI
	WASHINGTON	SUPPLE	US 43, SUNFLOWER TO
ARIZONA	SEVERAL	FINAL	GLEN CANYON NAT'L RE
ATLANTIC OCEAN		DRAFT	ATLANTIC OCEAN WASTE
		SUPPLE	SURF CLAM AND OCEAN
		SUPPLE	ATLANTIC GROUNDFISH
CALIFORNIA	CONTRA COSTA	FINAL	PORT/MARINA DEVELOP
	LOS ANGELES	DRAFT	TRANSIT SYSTEM IMPRO
	SANTA CRUZ	DRAFT	SANTA CRUZ WASTEWATE
	TUOLUMNE	DRAFT	TUOLUMNE RIVER WILD
COLORADO	SWEETWATER	DRAFT	THREE CORNERS AREA
	GRAND	DRAFT	COLORADO-BIG THOMPSO
	LARIMER	DRAFT	COLORADO-BIG THOMPSO
FLORIDA	MANATEE	SUPPLE	BEACH EROSION CONTRO
	MONROE	DRAFT	KEY WEST NAVAL AIR S
	POLK	DRAFT	FL-525, LAKEWOOD CIR
GEORGIA	SEVERAL	DRAFT	WALTER F. GEORGE LAK
	HART	FINAL	FIFTH UNIT INSTALLA
	DOUGLAS	FINAL	NORTH CAMP CREEK PAR
	FULTON	FINAL	NORTH CAMP CREEK PAR
GUAM		FINAL	GUAM COASTAL ZONE MA
GULF OF MEXICO		FINAL	OCS OIL AND GAS LEASE SA

RONMENTAL QUALITY
979
- BY STATE AND COUNTY

TEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	ORIG AGENCY NUMBER
NSTRUCTION APPLICATION PROCEDURES	90615	06-22-79	HUD
LAKE, LOCK AND DAM, O/M	90576	06-11-79	COE
NSMISSION AIN, ALEXANDER CITY	90557	06-04-79	HUD
TO LEROY	90593	06-14-79	DOT
L RECREATION AREA, MANAGEMENT	90627	06-22-79	DOI
ASTE DISPOSAL SITE DESIGNATION	90620	06-22-79	EPA
EAN QUAHOG INDUSTRIES, FMP (OS-2)	90573	06-08-79	DOC
ISH FMP, AMENDMENT (FS-3)	90640	06-27-79	DOC
LOPMENT PROJECT, RICHMOND	90623	06-22-79	HUD
PROVEMENTS, LOS ANGELES	90553	06-01-79	DOT
ATER FACILITIES PLAN, 201 GRANT	90599	06-18-79	EPA
ILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY	90636	06-26-79	USDA
EA GRAZING MANAGEMENT	90565	06-06-79	DOI
PSON WINDY GAP PROJECT	90602	06-18-79	DOI
PSON WINDY GAP PROJECT	90602	06-18-79	DOI
NTROL PROJECT, ANNA MARIA KEY	90605	06-19-79	COE
IR STATION, DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY	90558	06-05-79	GSA
CIRCUMFERENTIAL ROUTE	90644	06-25-79	DOT
LAKE, LOCK AND DAM, O/M	90576	06-11-79	COE
LLATION, HARTWELL LAKE, SAVANNAH R	90555	06-04-79	COE
PARKWAY EXTENSION	90634	06-26-79	DOT
PARKWAY EXTENSION	90634	06-26-79	DOT
MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CZM)	90625	06-22-79	DOC
SALE, NO 58A, GULF OF MEXICO	90647	06-28-79	DOI

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX -

STATE	COUNTY	STATUS	STATEME
HAWAII		DRAFT	HAWAII ARMY INSTALL
	HONOLULU	DRAFT	TRIPLER MEDICAL CENT
IDAHO	SEVERAL	DRAFT	SNAKE RIVER, WILD AN
	SEVERAL	DRAFT	SNAKE R, BIRDS OF P
	ADAMS	DRAFT	BRUNDAGE WATERSHED
	BONNER	FINAL	BOULDER PLANNING UNI
	BOUNDARY	FINAL	BOULDER PLANNING UNI
ILLINOIS		DRAFT	DISCONTINUANCE OF CO
	COOK	DRAFT	SOUTH STONY ISLAND A
	ST. CLAIR	FINAL	PEABODY COAL COMPANY
INDIANA		DRAFT	DISCONTINUANCE OF CO
	HAMILTON	DRAFT	SUNBLEST SUBDIVISION
IOWA	BLACKHAWK	SUPPLE	CEDAR RIVER LOCAL FL
KANSAS	SEDGWICK	DRAFT	DRY CREEK INTERCEPTO
KENTUCKY	CALDWELL	DRAFT	DONALDSON CREEK WATE
	CRITTENDEN	DRAFT	DONALDSON CREEK WATE
MAINE	PENOBSCOT	DRAFT	I-395 EXTENSION, BAN
MARYLAND	BALTIMORE	FINAL	LEXINGTON MARKET STA
	MONTGOMERY	DRAFT	MD-115, MONTGOMERY V
MASSACHUSETTS	ESSEX	FINAL	I-95/MA-128 INTERCHA

- BY STATE AND COUNTY

TEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	[illegible] NUMBER
ALLATIONS, ROUTINE OPERATIONS	90580	06-11-79	USA
CENTER ADDITION/ALTERATION, OAHU	90619	06-22-79	USA
D AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY	90618	06-22-79	DOI
F PREY NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA	90631	06-29-79	DOI
ED PLAN, RESERVOIR ENLARGEMENT	90591	06-14-79	USDA
UNIT LAND MGMT. PLAN	90569	06-05-79	USDA
UNIT LAND MGMT. PLAN	90568	06-05-79	USDA
F CONRAIL OPERATION	90597	06-15-79	ICC
ND AVENUE IMPROVEMENT	90655	06-29-79	DOT
PANY, PIT NO. 3 EXTENSION PERMIT	90626	06-22-79	COE
F CONRAIL OPERATION	90597	06-15-79	ICC
SION, MORTGAGE INSURANCE, FISHERS	90566	06-07-79	HUD
L FLOOD PROTECTION, EVANSDALE	90638	06-27-79	COE
EPTOR, WICHITA	90612	06-20-79	EPA
WATERSHED PROTECTION	90609	06-19-79	USDA
WATERSHED PROTECTION	90609	06-19-79	USDA
BANGOR TO BREWER	90629	06-25-79	DOT
STATION JOINT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT	90657	06-29-79	DOT
RY VILLAGE AVENUE TO NORBECK	90603	06-18-79	DOT
RCHANGE AND MA-128 IMPROVEMENTS	90587	06-14-79	DOT

COUNCIL ON E

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX -

STATE	COUNTY	STATUS	STATE
MASSACHUSETTS	SUFFOLK	FINAL	SOUTH END URBAN RE
		FINAL	I-93 & US 1 INTERCH
MICHIGAN	WAYNE	DRAFT	CADILLAC CENTER, C
	SEVERAL	FINAL	HIAWATHA N.F. TIMBE
	ALCONA	DRAFT	AUSABLE RIVER WILD
	BENZIE	DRAFT	RURAL LAKE WASTE TR
	CRAWFORD	DRAFT	AUSABLE RIVER WILD
	MONTMORENCY	DRAFT	MI-32, RELOCATION
	OSCODA	DRAFT	AUSABLE RIVER WILD
MINNESOTA	DAKOTA	FINAL	LEXINGTON SOUTH DE
		FINAL	BLACKHAWK PARK PLA
	KANDIYOHI	DRAFT	RURAL LAKE WASTE TR
MISSOURI	ST.LOUIS	DRAFT	LAMBERT-ST. LOUIS
MONTANA	FLATHEAD	DRAFT	WOLF PLANNING UNIT
		FINAL	ISLAND PLANNING UN
	LAKE	FINAL	ISLAND PLANNING UN
	LINCOLN	DRAFT	[illegible]
		DRAFT	COOL-BURNT PLANNING
		DRAFT	WOLF PLANNING UNIT
NEBRASKA	SEVERAL	FINAL	US 73/75 IMPROVEMEN
NEW HAMPSHIRE	MERRIMACK	SUPPLE	I-393 INTERCHANGE,
NEW MEXICO	CHAVES	DRAFT	EAST ROSWELL GRAZI
	EDDY	DRAFT	EAST ROSWELL GRAZI
	LEA	DRAFT	EAST ROSWELL GRAZI
	SANTA FE	DRAFT	NMT FACILITIES CONS

ATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	ORIG AGENCY NUMBER
RENEWAL PROJECT, BOSTON	90584	06-13-79	HUD
ERCHANGE, BOSTON & CAMBRIDGE	90604	06-19-79	DOT
, CONSTRUCTION (CDBG)	90656	06-29-79	HUD
IMBER PLAN	90633	06-26-79	USDA
ILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY	90635	06-26-79	USDA
E TREATMENT SYSTEMS, CASE STUDY 1	90654	06-29-79	EPA
ILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY	90635	06-26-79	USDA
ON OR RECONSTRUCTION	90601	06-18-79	DOT
ILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY	90635	06-26-79	USDA
DEVELOPMENT, EAGAN	90561	06-06-79	HUD
PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, EAGAN	90562	06-06-79	HUD
E TREATMENT, CASE STUDY 2	90614	06-21-79	EPA
TS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, ST. LOUIS	90598	06-15-79	DOT
NIT LAND MGMT. PLAN, KOOTENAI NF	[illegible]	[illegible]	USDA
UNIT, FLATHEAD NF	[illegible]	06-21-79	USDA
UNIT, FLATHEAD NF	90623	06-22-79	USDA
MOUNTAIN PLANNING UNIT, KOOTENAI NF	[illegible]	06-14-79	USDA
NING UNIT LAND MGMT., KOOTENAI NF	90592	06-14-79	USDA
NIT LAND MGMT. PLAN, KOOTENAI NF	90637	06-26-79	USDA
EMENT, NEBRASKA CITY TO OMAHA	90577	[illegible]	DOT
GE, FORT EDDY ROAD, CONCORD	90559	06-05-79	DOT
AZING MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	90567	[illegible]	DOI
AZING MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	[illegible]	06-05-79	DOI
AZING MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	[illegible]	[illegible]	DOI
CONSTRUCTION GRANT, SANTA FE	90622	06-22-79	EPA

COUNCIL ON ENVIR

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX

STATE	COUNTY	STATUS	STAT
NEW YORK	ERIE	FINAL	CAZENOVIA CREEK
NORTH CAROLINA	SEVERAL	DRAFT	GREAT SMOKEY MOUN
OHIO	FRANKLIN	FINAL	METROPOLITAN AREA
	MONTGOMERY	FINAL	HERBERT C. HUBER
	OTTAWA	FINAL	WEST HARBOR RECRE
	MONTGOMERY	SUPPLE	NEWFIELDS NEW COMMUN
OKLAHOMA	COMANCHE	DRAFT	FORT SILL TRAININ
OREGON	SEVERAL	DRAFT	SNAKE RIVER, WILD
	SEVERAL	DRAFT	WILLAMETTE RESERV
	COOS	SUPPLE	OREGON DUNES NRA
	DOUGLAS	SUPPLE	OREGON DUNES NRA
	LANE	FINAL	STRUBE LAKE AND
		SUPPLE	OREGON DUNES NRA
	MARION	FINAL	PINE TO TRADE ST
	MULTNOMAH	DRAFT	VA MEDICAL CENTER
		DRAFT	I-5, JANTZEN BEAC
	WASHINGTON	DRAFT	ALLEN BLVD., MURR
PENNSYLVANIA	LEBANON	FINAL	NATIONAL CEMETERY
	LUZERNE	DRAFT	SUSQUEHANNA STEAM
	LYCOMING	FINAL	US 15 RELOCATION,
PROGRAMMATIC		DRAFT	HAWAII ARMY INSTA
PUERTO RICO		DRAFT	VILLAS DE LOIZA
		FINAL	CARIBBEAN AREA SE
REGULATORY		DRAFT	TANK BARGES DESIG
		FINAL	ELECTRIC UTILITY
SEVERAL	SEVERAL	FINAL	MAMMALIAN PREDATOR D

NVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

DEX - BY STATE AND COUNTY

STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	ORIG AGENCY NUMBER
EK WATERSHED, FLOOD MANAGEMENT (2)	90464	06-12-79	COE
MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK, GENERAL MGMT	90615	06-20-79	DOI
AREA WWT FACILITIES, COLUMBUS	90575	06-1?-79	EPA
PER SUBDIVISION, WAYNE TOWNSHIP	90583	06-15-79	HUD
ECREATIONAL NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT	90578	06-11-79	COE
MMUNITY, TERMINATION, DAYTON PS	90595	06-15-79	HUD
INING INSTALLATION, ONGOING MISSION	90611	06-20-79	USA
WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY	90618	06-22-79	DOI
SERVOIR SYSTEM, O/M CONTINUATION	90616	06-22-79	COE
NRA MANAGEMENT PLAN, SIUSLAW NF	90555	06-04-79	USDA
NRA MANAGEMENT PLAN, SIUSLAW NF	90554	06-04-79	USDA
ND COUGAR ADDITIONAL UNIT, BLUE RIVER	90610	06-19-79	COE
NRA MANAGEMENT PLAN, SIUSLAW NF	90556	06-04-79	USDA
STREET, FRONT STREET BYPASS, SALEM	90558	06-07-79	DOT
NTER, HOSPITAL REPLACEMENT, PORTLAND	90552	06-01-79	VA
BEACH-DELTA PARK INTERCHANGE	90630	06-25-79	DOT
MURRY BLVD. TO ALICE LANE, BEAVERTON	90621	06-22-79	DOT
TERY, INDIANTOWN GAP	90567	06-07-79	VA
TEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2	90643	06-29-79	NRC
ION, US 220 TO PA-14	90631	06-25-79	DOT
NSTALLATIONS, ROUTINE OPERATIONS	90580	06-11-79	USA
ZA DEVELOPMENT, MORTGAGE INSURANCE	90645	06-28-79	HUD
A SERVICE INVESTIGATION, GRANT	90588	06-14-79	CAB
ESIGN STANDARDS/POLLUTION PREVENTION	90596	06-15-79	DOT
ITY STEAM GENERATING UNITS, STANDARDS	90594	06-15-79	EPA
OR DAMAGE MANAGEMENT, LIVESTOCK	90641	06-27-79	DOI

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX -

STATE	COUNTY	STATUS	STATEM
SOUTH CAROLINA	ANDERSON	FINAL	FIFTH UNIT INSTALLA
	CHARLESTON	DRAFT	FOLLY BEACH, BEACH
		FINAL	CHARLESTON CENTER,
	FAIRFIELD	DRAFT	VIRGIL C. SUMMER NU
TENNESSEE	SEVERAL	DRAFT	GREAT SMOKEY MOUNTA
TEXAS	ARANSAS	SUPPLE	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP
	CALHOUN	FINAL	VISTRON PETROCHEMIC
	FAYETTE	FINAL	FAYETTE POWER PROJE
	HARRIS	DRAFT	STEEPLECHASE SUBDIV
	HIDALGO	DRAFT	WILLACY AND HIDALG
	HOUSTON	DRAFT	DAVY CROCKETT NATIO
	LUBBOCK	DRAFT	I-27, LOOP 289 NORT
	NUECES	SUPPLE	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP
	SAN PATRICIA	SUPPLE	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP
	TRINITY	DRAFT	DAVY CROCKETT NATIO
	WILLACY	DRAFT	WILLACY AND HIDALGO
UTAH	UNITAH/DAGGETT	DRAFT	THREE CORNERS AREA
	SEVERAL	FINAL	GLEN CANYON NAT'L R
	SEVERAL	FINAL	BRIDGER-TETON NF, T
		FINAL	FERRON-PRICE PLANN
	RICH	DRAFT	RANDOLPH PLANNING U
WASHINGTON	SEVERAL	DRAFT	SNAKE RIVER, WILD A
	CLARK	DRAFT	CASCADE PARK PLANNE
	DOUGLAS	SUPPLE	OKANOGAN AREA SERVI
	LEWIS	FINAL	COWLITZ PLANNING UN
	OKANOGAN	SUPPLE	OKANOGAN AREA SERVI
	PIERCE	FINAL	COWLITZ PLANNING UN
	SNOHOMISH	FINAL	MARSHLAND WATERSHED
WISCONSIN	DANE	DRAFT	CAPITOL CENTRE REDEVELO
WYOMING	CAMPBELL	FINAL	SAGE BLUFFS RESIDEN

X - BY STATE AND COUNTY

ATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	ORIG AGENCY NUMBER
ALLATION, HARTWELL LAKE, SAVANNAH R	90555	06-04-79	COE
ACH EROSION CONTROL	90571	06-07-79	COE
ER, REDEVELOPMENT	90649	06-29-79	HUD
R NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT NO. 1	90652	06-29-79	NRC
UNTAINS NATIONAL PARK, GENERAL MGMT	90613	06-20-79	DOI
SHIP CHANNEL, M/D (FS-1)	90569	06-07-79	COE
EMICAL COMPLEX, NPDES PERMIT	90632	06-25-79	EPA
ROJECT, NPDES PERMIT	90579	06-12-79	EPA
DIVISION, MORTGAGE INSURANCE	90653	06-29-79	HUD
ALGO COUNTIES FLOOD CONTROL, PERMIT	90650	06-29-79	COE
ATIONAL FOREST TIMBER MANAGEMENT	90607	06-19-79	USDA
NORTH TO LOOP 289 SOUTH, EXTENSION	90600	06-18-79	DOT
SHIP CHANNEL, M/D (FS-1)	90569	06-07-79	COE
SHIP CHANNEL, M/D (FS-1)	90569	06-07-79	COE
ATIONAL FOREST TIMBER MANAGEMENT	90607	06-19-79	USDA
ALGO COUNTIES FLOOD CONTROL, PERMIT	90650	06-29-79	COE
REA GRAZING MANAGEMENT	90565	06-05-79	DOI
L RECREATION AREA, MANAGEMENT	90627	06-22-79	DOI
F, TIMBER MANAGEMENT PLAN	90589	06-14-79	USDA
ANNING UNIT, MANTI-LASAL NF	90606	06-19-79	USDA
NG UNIT GRAZING MANAGEMENT PLAN	90564	06-06-79	DOI
LD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY	90618	06-22-79	DOI
ANNED COMMUNITY, MORTGAGE INSURANCE	90628	06-25-79	HUD
ERVICE FACILITY, LOCATION (DS-2)	90574	06-08-79	DOE
G UNIT, GIFFORD PINCHOT NF	90617	06-22-79	USDA
ERVICE FACILITY, LOCATION (DS-2)	90574	06-08-79	DOE
G UNIT, GIFFORD PINCHOT NF	90617	06-22-79	USDA
SHED PROJECT, SNOHOMISH RIVER	90585	06-14-79	USDA
EVELOPMENT, MADISON	90642	06-27-79	HUD
IDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, GILLETE	90586	06-14-79	HUD

STATE	COUNTY	STATUS	STAT
WYOMING	CAMPBELL	FINAL	WRIGHT PLANNED CU
	PARK	DRAFT	CLARKS FORK WILD
WEST VIRGINIA	BOONE	FINAL	UPPER MUD RIVER WAT
	LINCOLN	FINAL	UPPER MUD RIVER WAT

STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	ORIG AGENCY NUMBER
D COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, WRIGHT	90646	06-28-79	HUD
ILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY	90608	06-19-79	USDA
WATERSHED PLAN, FLOOD PROTECTION	90639	06-27-79	USDA
WATERSHED PLAN, FLOOD PROTECTION	90639	06-27-79	USDA

COUNCIL ON EN
JUNE 197
STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY

AGENCY BUREAU	STATUS	STATE
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD		
	FINAL	CARIBBEAN AREA SER
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOREST SERVICE		
	DRAFT	HOODOO-FISHER MOU
		COOL-BURNT PLANNI
		DAVY CROCKETT NATI
		CLARKS FORK WILD
		AUSABLE RIVER WIL
		TUOLUMNE RIVER WI
		WOLF PLANNING UNI
	FINAL	BOULDER PLANNING
		BRIDGER-TETON NF,
		FERRON-PRICE PLAN
		COWLITZ PLANNING
		ISLAND PLANNING U
		HIAWATHA N.F. TIM
	SUPPLEM	OREGON DUNES NRA
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE		
	DRAFT	BRUNDAGE WATERSHE
		DONALDSON CREEK
	FINAL	MARSHLAND WATERSH
		UPPER MUD RIVER WATE
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE NAT'L OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMIN.		
	FINAL	GUAM COASTAL ZONE
	SUPPLEM	SURF CLAM AND OCE
		ATLANTIC GROUNDFI
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, ARMY		
	DRAFT	HAWAII ARMY INSTA
		FORT SILL TRAINI
		TRIPLER MEDICAL C
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION		
	SUPPLEM	OKANOGAN AREA SER

ONMENTAL QUALITY
1979
- BY AGENCY, BUREAU, & STATUS

TATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	NTIS ORDER NUMBER
SERVICE INVESTIGATION, GRANT	90588	06-14-79	(NONE)
MOUNTAIN PLANNING UNIT, KOOTENAI NF	90570	06-14-79	(NONE)
NNING UNIT LAND MGMT., KOOTENAI NF	90592	06-14-79	(NONE)
NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER MANAGEMENT	90607	06-19-79	(NONE)
LD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY	90603	06-19-79	(NONE)
WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY	90635	06-26-79	(NONE)
WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY	90636	06-26-79	(NONE)
UNIT LAND MGMT. PLAN, KOOTENAI NF	90637	06-26-79	(NONE)
NG UNIT LAND MGMT. PLAN	90560	06-05-79	(NONE)
NF, TIMBER MANAGEMENT PLAN	90569	06-14-79	(NONE)
PLANNING UNIT, MANTI-LASAL NF	90626	06-19-79	(NONE)
NG UNIT, GIFFORD PINCHOT NF	90617	06-22-79	(NONE)
NG UNIT, FLATHEAD NF	90624	06-22-79	(NONE)
TIMBER PLAN	90633	06-26-79	(NONE)
RA MANAGEMENT PLAN, SIUSLAW NF	90554	06-04-79	(NONE)
RSHED PLAN, RESERVOIR ENLARGEMENT	90591	06-14-79	(NONE)
ER WATERSHED PROTECTION	90627	06-19-79	(NONE)
ERSHED PROJECT, SNOHOMISH RIVER	90585	06-14-79	(NONE)
WATERSHED PLAN, FLOOD PROTECTION	90639	06-27-79	(NONE)
ZONE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CZM)	90625	06-22-79	(NONE)
OCEAN QUAHOG INDUSTRIES, FMP (DS-2)	90573	06-06-79	(NONE)
NDFISH FMP, AMENDMENT (FS-3)	90640	06-27-79	(NONE)
NSTALLATIONS, ROUTINE OPERATIONS	90589	06-11-79	(NONE)
INING INSTALLATION, ONGOING MISSION	90611	06-20-79	(NONE)
AL CENTER ADDITION/ALTERATION, OAHU	90619	06-22-79	(NONE)
SERVICE FACILITY, LOCATION (DS-2)	90574	06-06-79	(NONE)

COUNCIL ON ENV

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX -

AGENCY BUREAU	STATUS	ST
DEPARTMENT OF HUD		
	DRAFT	SUNBLEST SUBDIV
		SINGLE FAMILY C
		CASCADE PARK PL
		VILLAS DE LOIZ
		STEEPLECHASE S
	FINAL	LEXINGTON SOUT
		BLACKHAWK PARK
		HERBERT C, HUB
		SAGE BLUFFS RE
		WRIGHT PLANNED
	SUPPLE	NEWFIELDS NEW COM
SECTION 104(H)	DRAFT	HIGH SERVICE T
		CADILLAC CENTE
	FINAL	SOUTH END URBA
		PORT/MARINA DE
		CHARLESTON CEN
	DRAFT	CAPITOL CENTRE RE
DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT		
	DRAFT	EAST ROSWELL G
		RANDOLPH PLANN
		THREE CORNERS
		SNAKE R, BIRDS
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION	FINAL	OCS OIL AND GAS
	DRAFT	COLORADO-BIG T
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE		
	DRAFT	GREAT SMOKEY M
		SNAKE RIVER, W
	FINAL	GLEN CANYON NA
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE		
	FINAL	MAMMALIAN PREDAT
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION		
	DRAFT	LAMBERT-ST, LO
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION		
	DRAFT	I-27, LOOP 289
		MI-32, RELOCAT
		MD-115, MONTGO
		ALLEN BLVD., M
		I-395 EXTENSIO
		I-5, JANTZEN
		FL-525, LAKEWO

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

EX - BY AGENCY, BUREAU, & STATUS

STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	NTIS ORDER NUMBER
BDIVISION, MORTGAGE INSURANCE, FISHERS	90566	06-07-79	(NONE)
LY CONSTRUCTION APPLICATION PROCEDURES	90615	06-22-79	(NONE)
K PLANNED COMMUNITY, MORTGAGE INSURANCE	90624	06-25-79	(NONE)
OIZA DEVELOPMENT, MORTGAGE INSURANCE	90645	06-28-79	(NONE)
E SUBDIVISION, MORTGAGE INSURANCE	90653	06-29-79	(NONE)
OUTH DEVELOPMENT, EAGAN	90561	06-06-79	(NONE)
ARK PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, EAGAN	90562	06-06-79	(NONE)
HUBER SUBDIVISION, WAYNE TOWNSHIP	90583	06-13-79	(NONE)
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, GILLETE	90586	06-14-79	(NONE)
NED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, WRIGHT	90646	06-28-79	(NONE)
COMMUNITY, TERMINATION, DAYTON FS	90595	06-15-79	(NONE)
E TRANSMISSION MAIN, ALEXANDER CITY	90557	06-04-79	(NONE)
NTER, CONSTRUCTION (CDBG)	90656	06-29-79	(NONE)
RBAN RENEWAL PROJECT, BOSTON	90584	06-13-79	(NONE)
DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, RICHMOND	90623	06-22-79	(NONE)
CENTER, REDEVELOPMENT	90649	06-29-79	(NONE)
RE REDEVELOPMENT, MADISON	90642	06-27-79	(NONE)
L GRAZING MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	90563	06-06-79	(NONE)
LANNING UNIT GRAZING MANAGEMENT PLAN	90564	06-06-79	(NONE)
ERS AREA GRAZING MANAGEMENT	90565	06-06-79	(NONE)
RDS OF PREY NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA	90651	06-29-79	(NONE)
GAS LEASE SALE, NO. 58A, GULF OF MEXICO	90647	06-28-79	(NONE)
IG THOMPSON WINDY GAP PROJECT	90602	06-18-79	(NONE)
EY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK, GENERAL MGMT	90613	06-20-79	(NONE)
R, WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY	90618	06-22-79	(NONE)
N NAT'L RECREATION AREA, MANAGEMENT	90627	06-22-79	(NONE)
EDATOR DAMAGE MANAGEMENT, LIVESTOCK	90641	06-27-79	(NONE)
. LOUIS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, ST. LOUIS	90598	06-15-79	(NONE)
269 NORTH TO LOOP 289 SOUTH, EXTENSION	90600	06-18-79	(NONE)
OCATION OR RECONSTRUCTION	90601	06-18-79	(NONE)
NTGOMERY VILLAGE AVENUE TO NORBECK	90603	06-18-79	(NONE)
., MURRY BLVD. TO ALICE LANE, BEAVERTON	90621	06-22-79	(NONE)
NSION, BANGOR TO BREWER	90629	06-25-79	(NONE)
EN BEACH-DELTA PARK INTERCHANGE	90630	06-25-79	(NONE)
KEWOOD CIRCUMFERENTIAL ROUTE	90644	06-28-79	(NONE)

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONM

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY AG

AGENCY BUREAU	STATUS	STATEMEN
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION		
	DRAFT	SOUTH STONY ISLAND A
	FINAL	PINE TO TRADE STREET,
		NORTH CAMP CREEK PARKWAY
		US 73/75 IMPROVEMENT,
		I-95/MA-128 INTERCHA
		I-93 & US 1 INTERCHA
		US 15 RELOCATION, US
	SUPPLE	US 43, SUNFLOWER TO LERO
		I-393 INTERCHANGE, FO
U.S.COAST GUARD		
	DRAFT	TANK BARGES DESIGN S
URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION		
	DRAFT	TRANSIT SYSTEM IMPRO
	FINAL	LEXINGTON MARKET STA
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY		
EPA, HEADQUARTERS		
	DRAFT	ATLANTIC OCEAN WASTE
	FINAL	ELECTRIC UTILITY STE
EPA, REGION 5		
	DRAFT	RURAL LAKE WASTE TRE
		RURAL LAKE WASTE TRE
	FINAL	METROPOLITAN AREA WA
EPA, REGION 6		
	DRAFT	GAS FACILITIES CONST
	FINAL	FAYETTE POWER [illegible]
		CISTRON PETROCHEMICA
EPA, REGION 7		
	DRAFT	DRY CREEK INTERCEPTO
EPA, REGION 9		
	DRAFT	SANTA CRUZ WASTEWATE
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION		
	DRAFT	KEY WEST NAVAL AIR S
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION		
	DRAFT	DISCONTINUANCE OF CO

NMENTAL QUALITY

Y AGENCY, BUREAU, & STATUS

EMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	NTIS ORDER NUMBER
D AVENUE IMPROVEMENT	90655	06-29-79	(NONE)
EET, FRONT STREET BYPASS, SALEM	90568	06-07-79	(NONE)
RKWAY EXTENSION	90634	06-26-79	(NONE)
T, NEBRASKA CITY TO OMAHA	90577	06-11-79	(NONE)
CHANGE AND MA-128 IMPROVEMENTS	90587	06-14-79	(NONE)
CHANGE, BOSTON & CAMBRIDGE	90604	06-19-79	(NONE)
, US 220 TO PA-14	90631	06-25-79	(NONE)
LEROY	90593	06-14-79	(NONE)
, FORT EDDY ROAD, CONCORD	90559	06-05-79	(NONE)
N STANDARDS/POLLUTION PREVENTION	90596	06-15-79	(NONE)
PROVEMENTS, LOS ANGELES	90553	06-01-79	(NONE)
STATION JOINT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT	90657	06-29-79	(NONE)
ASTE DISPOSAL SITE DESIGNATION	90620	06-22-79	(NONE)
STEAM GENERATING UNITS, STANDARDS	90598	06-15-79	(NONE)
TREATMENT, CASE STUDY 2	90614	06-21-79	(NONE)
TREATMENT SYSTEMS, CASE STUDY 1	90654	06-29-79	(NONE)
AT FACILITIES, COLUMBUS	90575	06-08-79	(NONE)
NSTRUCTION GRANT, SANTA FE	90622	06-22-79	(NONE)
JECT, NPDES PERMIT	90579	06-12-79	(NONE)
TICAL COMPLEX, NPDES PERMIT	90632	06-25-79	(NONE)
PTION, WICHITA	90612	06-20-79	(NONE)
ATER FACILITIES PLAN, 201 GRANT	90599	06-18-79	(NONE)
IR STATION, DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY	90558	06-05-79	(NONE)
CONRAIL OPERATION	90597	06-15-79	(NONE)

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY AGE

GENCY BUREAU	STATUS	STATEMENT
UCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION		
	DRAFT	SUSQUEHANNA STEAM ELEC
		VIRGIL C. SUMMER NUCLE
.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS		
	DRAFT	FOLLY BEACH, [illegible]
		WALTER F. GEORGE L
		WILLAMETTE RESERVOIR S
		WILLACY AND HIDALGO C
	FINAL	CAZENOVIA CREEK WATER-
		FIFTH UNIT INSTALLATIO
		[illegible] RECREATION
		[illegible] LAKE AND COUGAR
		PEABODY COAL COMPANY,
	SUPPLE	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CH
		BEACH EROSION CONTROL
		CEDAR RIVER LOCAL FLOO
ETERANS ADMINISTRATION		
	DRAFT	VA MEDICAL CENTER, HOU
	FINAL	NATIONAL CEMETERY, IND

AGENCY, BUREAU, & STATUS

ENT TITLE	[illegible]	DATE FILED	[illegible]
LECTRIC STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
CLEAR STATION, UNIT NO. 1	90692	06-29-79	(NONE)
[illegible]	90571	06-07-79	(NONE)
[illegible]	[illegible]	06-11-79	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	06-23-79	(NONE)
COUNTIES FLOOD CONTROL, PERMIT	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
FLOOD MANAGEMENT (I)	[illegible]	06-12-79	[illegible]
TION, HARTWELL LAKE, SAVANNAH R	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
TIONAL NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT	90578	06-11-79	(NONE)
ADDITIONAL UNIT, [illegible] RIVER	[illegible]	[illegible]	(NONE)
Y, PIT NO. 3 EXTENSION PERMIT	[illegible]	[illegible]	(NONE)
CHANNEL, M/D (F3-1)	[illegible]	06-07-79	(NONE)
OL PROJECT, ANNA MARIA KEY	90665	06-19-79	(NONE)
FLOOD PROTECTION, EVANSDALE	90638	06-27-79	(NONE)
HOSPITAL REPLACEMENT, PORTLAND	90552	06-01-79	(NONE)
INDIANTOWN GAP	90567	06-07-79	(NONE)

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGI
JUNE 1979
102 STATEMENT SUMMARY

AGENCY	DRAFT 102'S (NO FINAL)	FINAL	SUPPLEMENTS	TOTAL
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD	0	1	0	1
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE	9	8	1	18
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE	0	1	2	3
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, ARMY	3	0	0	3
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	0	0	1	1
DEPARTMENT OF HUD	8	8	1	17
DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR	7	3	0	10
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	11	7	2	[illegible]
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY	6	4	0	[illegible]
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION	1	0	0	1
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION	1	0	0	1
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION	2	0	0	2
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS	4	5	3	12
VETERANS ADMINISTRATION	1	1	0	2
TOTALS	53	38	10	101

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

MR. BARRY FLAMM
COORDINATOR
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACTIVITIES,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
ROOM 412A
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
(202) 447-3965

FOREST SERVICE

DATE

UMNE RIVER WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY 06/26

LIFORNIA
NTY: TUOLUMNE
POSED IS THE DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN SEGMENTS OF THE TUOLUMNE RIVER LOCATED IN TUOLUMNE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, AS UNITS OF THE NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVER SYSTEM. A 92 MILE PORTION OF THE RIVER WAS IDENTIFIED AS A POSSIBLE CANDIDATE FOR WILD AND SCENIC DESIGNATION. A 62 MILE PORTION OF THE RIVER, INCLUDING AN INELIGIBLE 8 MILE RESERVOIR, WITHIN YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK IS RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION IN THE SYSTEM AND IS CURRENTLY MANAGED AS SUCH. THE REMAINING 30 MILE PORTION, INCLUDING AN INELIGIBLE 1 MILE SEGMENT, OFFER POTENTIAL FOR A VARIETY OF FUTURE USES. THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDER NO ACTION AND INCLUSION OF VARIOUS PORTIONS OF THE RIVER IN THE SYSTEM. (DEIS-05-16-78-09)
(EIS ORDER # 90636)

AUSABLE RIVER WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY 06/26

MICHIGAN
COUNTY: ALCONA CRAWFORD OSCODA
PROPOSED IS THE AUSABLE RIVER WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY LOCATED IN THE COUNTIES OF ALCONA, CRAWFORD, AND OSCODA, MICHIGAN. THE RECOMMENDATION IS FOR THE INCLUSION OF 91 MILES OF THE RIVER IN THE NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVER SYSTEM. WITHIN THE 91 MILES DESIGNATED, 70 MILES ARE LOCATED IN THE HURON NATIONAL FOREST AND 21 MILES ARE LOCATED WITHIN STATE FOREST BOUNDARIES. THE 91 MILES CONSIST OF 4 SEGMENTS. ONE SEGMENT OF 35 MILES IS TO BE CLASSIFIED AS RECREATIONAL, AND 3 SEGMENTS TOTALING 56 MILES ARE TO BE CLASSIFIED AS SCENIC. IN ADDITION TO NO ACTION, FIVE ALTERNATIVES ARE CONSIDERED.
(EIS ORDER # 90635)

HOODOO-FISHER MOUNTAIN PLANNING UNIT, KOOTENAI NF 06/14

MONTANA
COUNTY: LINCOLN
PROPOSED IS A LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR HOODOO-FISHER MOUNTAIN PLANNING UNIT, KOOTENAI NATIONAL FOREST, LINCOLN

COUNTY, MONTANA. FOUR PLANS HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED. ALTERNATIVE A INVOLVES MANAGEMENT OF THE UNIT FOR PRIMITIVE, DISPERSED, AND DEVELOPED RECREATION. ALTERNATIVE B PROVIDES OPTIMUM PRODUCTION OF GOODS AND SERVICES. ALTERNATIVE C CONCERNS WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT OF GRIZZLY HABITAT, AREAS OF HIGH SCENIC VALUE, AND PROVIDES A BALANCE OF FORAGE AND COVER FOR BIG GAME. ALTERNATIVE D EMPHASIZES COMMODITY PRODUCTION WITH PROVISIONS FOR DISPERSED RECREATION, BIG GAME, FRAGILE SOILS, AND SCENIC QUALITIES.
(01-14-79-08-USDA-FS-DES(ADM))
(EIS ORDER # 90590)

DRAFT DATE

COOL-BURNT PLANNING UNIT LAND MGMT., KOOTENAI NF 06/14

MONTANA
COUNTY: LINCOLN
PROPOSED IS A LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE COOL-BURNT PLANNING UNIT OF THE KOOTENAI NATIONAL FOREST IN LINCOLN COUNTY, MONTANA. THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE FOR THE 35,280 ACRE UNIT EMPHASIZES DISPERSED RECREATION, GRIZZLY BEAR AND MOOSE HABITATS, AND VISUAL RESOURCES. APPROXIMATELY 12,300 ACRES ARE ALLOTTED FOR TIMBER PRODUCTION WITH 6,300 ACRES OF THAT ALLOTMENT CONSTRAINED BY VISUAL REQUIREMENTS. THE GRIZZLY PEAK ROADLESS AREA IS LARGELY ALLOCATED FOR DISPERSED RECREATION AND GRIZZLY BEAR HABITAT. FOUR OTHER ALTERNATIVES ARE CONSIDERED.
(01-14-79-09-USDA-FS-DES-(ADM))
(EIS ORDER # 90592)

WOLF PLANNING UNIT LAND MGMT. PLAN, KOOTENAI NF 06/26

MONTANA
COUNTY: FLATHEAD LINCOLN
PROPOSED IS A LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE WOLF PLANNING UNIT OF THE KOOTENAI NATIONAL FOREST IN LINCOLN AND FLATHEAD COUNTIES, MONTANA. THE UNIT CONTAINS 40,699 ACRES OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS. THREE ALTERNATIVES AND ONE SUB-ALTERNATIVE ARE CONSIDERED AND COMPARED AGAINST A REFERENCE BASE ALTERNATIVE (NO ACTION). THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE STRESSES BOTH THE PRODUCTION OF COMMODITIES AND WILDLIFE CONSIDERATIONS WHILE ALSO RECOGNIZING THE VISUAL RESOURCES. THE OTHER ALTERNATIVES STRESS: 1) AMENITY/RECREATION, 2) COMMODITY PRODUCTION, AND 3) MODIFIED COMMODITY PRODUCTION.
(USDA-FS-DES(ADM)-01-14-79-10)
(EIS ORDER # 90637)

DAVY CROCKETT NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER MANAGEMENT 06/19

TEXAS
COUNTY: HOUSTON TRINITY
PROPOSED IS A TIMBER MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE DAVY CROCKETT NATIONAL FOREST IN HOUSTON AND TRINITY COUNTIES, TEXAS. THE PLAN PROPOSES EVEN-AGED FOREST MANAGEMENT ON THE COMMERCIAL FOREST LAND FOR PRODUCTION OF TIMBER PROJECTS ON A MULTIPLE USE-SUSTAINED YIELD BASIS EXCEPT WHERE RESERVED FOR A SPECI-

FIC USE. THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED ARE: 1) LOW UTILIZATION MANAGEMENT, 2) ALL-AGED MANAGEMENT, 3) HIGH-YIELD EVEN-AGED MANAGEMENT WITH SHORT ROTATIONS, 4) EVEN-AGED MANAGEMENT, AND 5) NO ACTION.
(DES-08-13-79-02)
(EIS ORDER # 90607)

DRAFT

CLARKS FORK WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY 06/19

WYOMING
COUNTY: PARK
PROPOSED IS A WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY OF CLARKS FORK OF THE YELLOWSTONE RIVER LOCATED IN THE SHOSHONE NATIONAL FOREST IN PARK COUNTY, WYOMING. IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT ALL 23 MILES OF THE STUDY AREA ARE ELIGIBLE FOR INCLUSION IN THE SYSTEM, AND IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT 22 MILES BE CLASSIFIED AS A WILD RIVER. OPPORTUNITIES FOR CONSTRUCTION OF DAY USE RECREATION FACILITIES AND IMPROVING THE EXISTING PRIMITIVE ROAD TO THE RIVER WILL BE PROVIDED.
(DES-02-14-79-04)
(EIS ORDER # 90608)

FINAL DATE

BOULDER PLANNING UNIT LAND MGMT. PLAN 06/05

IDAHO
COUNTY: BOUNDARY BONNER
PROPOSED ARE EIGHT ALTERNATIVES FOR A LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE 58,000 ACRE BOULDER PLANNING UNIT, IDAHO PANHANDLE NATIONAL FORESTS IN BOUNDARY AND BONNER COUNTIES, IDAHO. THIS REVISED FINAL STATEMENT REPLACES THE ORIGINAL FINAL EIS, #70542, FILED 5-22-77. THIS STATEMENT REFLECTS CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS FOR TIMBER, BIG GAME SUMMER RANGE, AND DISPERSED RECREATION. ROADLESS AREAS CONTIGUOUS TO THE BOULDER UNIT HAVE BEEN REEVALUATED TO DETERMINE WHETHER THEY SHOULD BE RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION IN THE NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM.
(USDA-FS-ADM-01-04-76-22)
COMMENTS MADE BY: COE DOI EPA FPC
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
INDIVIDUALS
(EIS ORDER # 90560)

HIAWATHA N.F. TIMBER PLAN 06/26

MICHIGAN
COUNTY: SEVERAL
PROPOSED IS A TIMBER RESOURCE PLAN FOR THE HIAWATHA NATIONAL FOREST FOR THE PERIOD JUNE, 1978 TO JUNE, 1988. THE PLAN DEVELOPS A POTENTIAL YIELD OF 1382 MCCF; THE INITIAL PROGRAMMED YIELD WILL BE 53 PERCENT OF THE PLANNED POTENTIAL YIELD. THE PLAN ALSO PROVIDES FOR THE PLANTING OF 13,000 ACRES, SEEDING 12,200 ACRES, SITE PREPARATION ON 70,000 ACRES, TSI ON 17,900 ACRES, AND AN

ESTIMATED 350 MILES OF ROAD CONSTRUCTION OR RECONSTRUCTION IN THE 10-YEAR PLAN PERIOD. THE HIAWATHA NATIONAL FOREST IS LOCATED IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN AND IN THE COUNTIES OF ALGER, DELTA, SCHOOLCRAFT, CHIPPEWA, AND MACKINAC. (USDA-FS-R9-FES-ADM-77-08)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA EPA DOI
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90633)

FINAL DATE

ISLAND PLANNING UNIT, FLATHEAD NF 06/22

MONTANA
COUNTY: FLATHEAD LAKE
PROPOSED IS A REVISED LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE ISLAND PLANNING UNIT, LOCATED ON THE SWAN LAKE RANGER DISTRICT, FLATHEAD NATIONAL FOREST, IN FLATHEAD AND LAKE COUNTIES, MONTANA. THE PLAN AFFECTS 52,500 ACRES OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS AND RECOMMENDS THAT THE UNIT BE MANAGED AS FOLLOWS: 42,300 ACRES FOR HIGH INTENSITY TIMBER PRODUCTION; 9,700 ACRES FOR LOW INTENSITY TIMBER MANAGEMENT; VISUAL QUALITY AND WHITETAILED DEER HABITAT; AND 200 ACRES TO PRESERVE A UNIQUE AREA. THE ALTERNATIVES DISCUSSED CONSIDER VARIOUS BALANCES OF SURFACE AND SUBSURFACE RESOURCE USE WITH WILDLIFE, RECREATIONAL AND VISUAL RESOURCES.
(USDA-FS-R1(10)FES-ADM-79-03)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA DOE EPA DOI DOT
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS, INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90624)

BRIDGER-TETON NF, TIMBER MANAGEMENT PLAN 06/14

UTAH
COUNTY: SEVERAL
PROPOSED IS A TIMBER MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE BRIDGER-TETON NATIONAL FOREST IN LINCOLN, SUBLETTE, TETON, FREMONT, AND PARK COUNTIES, WYOMING. THE PLAN WILL ENCOMPASS APPROXIMATELY 3,439,807 ACRES AND REPLACES 2 EXISTING PLANS APPROVED IN THE MID-SIXTIES. SEVEN ALTERNATIVES ARE CONSIDERED. THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE INCLUDES: 1) TIMBER MANAGEMENT AND PRODUCTION; 2) WILDERNESS AREA MANAGEMENT; 3) MAINTENANCE OF RURAL COMMUNITIES; AND 4) REDUCTION OF LOSSES FROM INSECTS, DISEASE, AND FIRE.
(USDA-FS-FES-(ADM)-R4-79-1)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA HUD DOI
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS, INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90589)

FERRON-PRICE PLANNING UNIT, MANTI-LASAL NF 06/19

UTAH
COUNTY: SEVERAL
PROPOSED ARE FIVE ALTERNATIVES FOR MANAGEMENT OF THE FERRON-

PRICE PLANNING UNIT. THE PLANNING UNIT INCLUDES 531,500 ACRES OF THE MANTI-LASAL NATIONAL FOREST IN CARBON, EMERY, SANPETE, UTAH AND SEVIER COUNTIES, UTAH. THE FIVE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDER FEATURES SUCH AS: 1) WILDERNESS CLASSIFICATION OF INVENTORIED ROADLESS AREA; 2) TIMBER HARVEST/MINERAL RESOURCES USES; 3)EMPHASIS ON WILDLIFE HABITATS, WATER PRODUCTION, AND RECREATION; AND 4) LIVESTOCK GRAZING AND FORAGE PRODUCTION.
(USDA-FS-R4-FES(ADM)-04-10-79-02)
COMMENTS MADE BY: AHP USDA HEW DOI
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS, INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90606)

FINAL DATE

COWLITZ PLANNING UNIT, GIFFORD PINCHOT NF 06/22

WASHINGTON
COUNTY: LEWIS PIERCE
PROPOSED IS A LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE COWLITZ PLANNING UNIT, GIFFORD PINCHOT NATIONAL FOREST, LEWIS AND PIERCE COUNTIES, WASHINGTON. THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED ARE: 1) NONINTENSIVE MANAGEMENT WITH EMPHASIS ON WILDERNESS AND RECREATION; 2) A MIXTURE OF TIMBER PRODUCTION AND RECREATION; 3) MAXIMUM PRODUCTION OF WOOD FIBER AND LIVESTOCK FORAGE; 4) NO ACTION; AND 5) MAXIMUM TIMBER YIELD WITH CONSIDERATION FOR WILDERNESS, RECREATIONAL AND WILDLIFE AREAS, AND ELK WINTER RANGE.
(USDA-FS-R6-FES(ADM)-78-13)

COMMENTS MADE BY: DOE FERC COE HUD USDA EPA DOI
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS, INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90617)

FINAL SUPPLEMENT DATE

OREGON DUNES NRA MANAGEMENT PLAN, SIUSLAW NF 06/04

OREGON
COUNTY: COOS DOUGLAS LANE
THIS STATEMENT SUPPLEMENTS FINAL EIS #70042, FILED 1-11-77 CONCERNING A MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE OREGON DUNES NATIONAL RECREATION AREA LOCATED IN COOS, DOUGLAS, AND LANE COUNTIES, OREGON. THE PURPOSE OF THE SUPPLEMENT IS TO: 1) DELETE REFERENCES FOR THE NONWILDERNESS RECOMMENDATION, 2) UPDATE INFORMATION REGARDING LAND STATUS, AND 3) TO INDICATE THAT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MANAGEMENT PLAN WILL RECOGNIZE THE REEVALUATION PROCESS, AND THAT NO DEVELOPMENTS OR ACTIVITIES WILL BE PERMITTED ON THE UNROADED AREAS WHICH WOULD ADVERSELY AFFECT WILDERNESS VALUES THAT MAY BE PRESENT.
(USDA-FS-R6-FES(ADM)-75-01-SUPP.)
(EIS ORDER # 90554)

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

DRAFT DATE

BRUNDAGE WATERSHED PLAN, RESERVOIR ENLARGEMENT 06/14

IDAHO
COUNTY: ADAMS
PROPOSED IS FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BRUNDAGE WATERSHED PLAN IN ADAMS COUNTY, IDAHO. THE PLAN INCLUDES THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE BRUNDAGE RESERVOIR TO A STORAGE CAPACITY OF 7,330 ACRE FEET, THE IMPROVEMENT AND EXTENSION OF EXISTING CANALS, INCLUDING NECESSARY STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS SUCH AS DIVERSIONS AND HEADGATES, AND THE APPLICATION OF LAND TREATMENT MEASURES. THE RESERVOIR WILL CONTAIN A 500 ACRE FOOT CONSERVATION POOL. THE PURPOSE OF THIS PLAN IS TO PROVIDE FULL SEASON IRRIGATION WATER SUPPLY, IMPROVE OVERALL IRRIGATION EFFICIENCIES, AND IMPROVE FISHERY AND WILDLIFE HABITATS.
(USDA-SCS-EIS-WS-(ADM)-79-1-(D)-ID)
(EIS ORDER # 90591)

DONALDSON CREEK WATERSHED PROTECTION 06/19

KENTUCKY
COUNTY: CALDWELL CRITTENDEN
PROPOSED IS A WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION PLAN FOR THE DONALDSON CREEK WATERSHED LOCATED IN CALDWELL AND CRITTENDEN COUNTIES, KENTUCKY. THE REMAINING MEASURES TO BE TAKEN ARE THE CONSTRUCTION OF TWO FLOODWATER RETARDING STRUCTURES. ACCELERATED LAND TREATMENT MEASURES, 5 RETARDING STRUCTURES, AND 6,700 FEET OF CHANNEL WORK HAVE BEEN COMPLETED. THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED ARE: 1) THE PURCHASE OF FLOWAGE EASEMENTS ON THE FLOOD PLAIN EQUAL TO THE AREA THAT WOULD BE INUNDATED BY A 2-YEAR FREQUENCY FLOOD, 2) TAKE NO ACTION, 3) CONDUCT 24.8 MILES OF CHANNEL WORK, AND 4) INSTALLATION OF THE REMAINING STRUCTURES AND 24.8 MILES OF CHANNEL. (USDA-SCS-EIS-WS-(ADM)-79-1-D-KY)
(EIS ORDER # 90609)

FINAL DATE

MARSHLAND WATERSHED PROJECT, SNOHOMISH RIVER 06/14

WASHINGTON
COUNTY: SNOHOMISH
THIS PROPOSAL CONCERNS WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION IN SNOHOMISH COUNTY, WASHINGTON. THE PROJECT WOULD FINISH THE REMAINING WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT INVOLVING THE RECONSTRUCTION AND RAISING OF APPROXIMATELY 2.9 MILES OF EXISTING LEVEE TO PROVIDE THE SAME LEVEL OF PROTECTION AS IS NOW BEING PROVIDED BY THE 2 REACHES OF LEVEE ALONG THE SNOHOMISH RIVER. THIS WILL REQUIRE RAISING THE LEVEE BY ABOUT THREE FEET, AND THE USE OF RIPRAP IN SOME SECTIONS.
(USDA-SCS-ES-WS-(ADM)-78-1(F)-WA)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA USA HEW DOI DOT AHP
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS, INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90585)

UPPER MUD RIVER WATERSHED PLAN, FLOOD PROTECTION 06/27

WEST VIRGINIA
COUNTY: LINCOLN BOONE
PROPOSED IS A WATERSHED PLAN FOR THE UPPER MUD RIVER, LINCOLN AND BOONE COUNTIES, WEST VIRGINIA. PLAN IMPLEMENTATION CALLS FOR THE INSTALLATION OF LAND TREATMENT MEASURES, FLOODWATER RETARDING STRUCTURES, RECREATION FACILITIES, AND THE PREPARATION OF FLOOD-PLAIN MAPS TO ASSIST IN ADOPTING ZONING ORDINANCES PROHIBITING DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE 100-YEAR PROJECT FLOOD PLAIN. THIS STATEMENT REPLACES THE ORIGINAL FINAL EIS. #80634, FILED 6-14-78.
(USDA-SCS-EIS-WS-(ADM)-78-1-(F)-WV)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USA HEW DOI EPA USDA ORBC
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90639)

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

CONTACT: MR. RICHARD MAKINEN
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY
ATTN: DAEN-CWR-P
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
20 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20314
(202) 272-0121

DRAFT DATE

WALTER F. GEORGE LAKE, LOCK AND DAM, O/M 06/11

GEORGIA ALABAMA
COUNTY: SEVERAL
PROPOSED IS THE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE WALTER F. GEORGE LAKE LOCK AND DAM LOCATED ON THE CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER BETWEEN CLAY COUNTY, GEORGIA AND HENRY COUNTY, ALABAMA. THE SURROUNDING IMPOUNDMENT AREA OF THE DAM ALSO INCLUDES QUITMAN, STEWART AND CHATTAHOOCHEE COUNTIES IN GEORGIA AND BARBOUR AND RUSSELL COUNTIES IN ALABAMA. THE FACILITIES WILL INCLUDE A POWERHOUSE, LOCK, DAM AND RESERVOIR, INCLUDING ASSOCIATED BUILDINGS, WATER QUALITY MONITORS, ACCESS ROADS, PUBLIC USE AREAS, AND BOAT CHANNELS. THE PORTION OF THE CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER INVOLVED EXTENDS FROM COLUMBUS, GEORGIA TO 20 MILES BELOW THE DAM.
(MOBILE DISTRICT)
(EIS ORDER # 90576)

WILLAMETTE RESERVOIR SYSTEM, O/M CONTINUATION 06/22

OREGON
COUNTY: SEVERAL
PROPOSED IS THE CONTINUATION OF THE CURRENT OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE WILLAMETTE RESERVOIR SYSTEM LOCATED IN SEVERAL COUNTIES OF OREGON. THE SYSTEM CONSISTS OF ELEVEN STORAGE AND TWO REREGULATING RESERVOIRS CONSTRUCTED BY THE COE ON THE WILLAMETTE RIVER AND ITS TRIBUTARIES. SPECIFIC AUTHORIZED PURPOSES OF THE PROJECT ARE FLOOD CONTROL, IRRIGATION, NAVIGATION, POWER PRODUCTION, MAINTENANCE OF FISH LIFE THROUGH MINIMUM FLOWS AND STREAM PURIFICATION. INCIDENTAL PURPOSES OF THE PROJECT INCLUDE RECREATION, WILDLIFE AND MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL WATER SUPPLIES.
(PORTLAND DISTRICT)
(EIS ORDER # 90616)

FOLLY BEACH, BEACH EROSION CONTROL 06/07

SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY: CHARLESTON
PROPOSED IS A BEACH EROSION CONTROL AND HURRICANE PROTECTION PROJECT FOR FOLLY BEACH ON FOLLY ISLAND, CHARLESTON COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA. THE IMPROVEMENTS INCLUDE RESTORATION AND PERIODIC RENOURISHMENT OF A CONTINUOUS REACH OF BEACH FOR

16,860 FEET, WHICH WOULD REQUIRE 684,000 CUBIC YARDS OF FILL MATERIAL. A BERM 25 FEET WIDE WOULD BE CONSTRUCTED ALONG THE ENTIRE LENGTH OF THE PROJECT. ADDITIONAL SANITARY FACILITIES WILL ALSO BE CONSTRUCTED.
(CHARLESTON DISTRICT)
(EIS ORDER # 90571)

DRAFT

WILLACY AND HIDALGO COUNTIES FLOOD CONTROL, PERMIT 06/29

TEXAS
COUNTY: WILLACY HIDALGO
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF A CONSTRUCTION PERMIT FOR FLOOD CONTROL AND MAJOR DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS IN WILLACY AND HIDALGO COUNTIES, TEXAS. THE PLAN INVOLVES THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN OUTFALL CHANNEL WHICH WOULD BE PART OF AN EXTENSIVE OVERALL PLAN TO CONSTRUCT OR IMPROVE ABOUT 194 MILES OF EARTHEN CHANNELS AND LATERALS, AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF 17 PUMPING STATIONS. THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED ARE: 1) NO ACTION, 2) ALTERNATIVE CHANNEL DIMENSIONS AND CONFIGURATIONS, AND 3) ALTERNATIVE PLANS FOR DRAINAGE AND FLOOD CONTROL.
(GALVESTON DISTRICT)
(EIS ORDER # 90650)

FINAL DATE

FIFTH UNIT INSTALLATION, HARTWELL LAKE, SAVANNAH R 06/04

GEORGIA SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY: HART ANDERSON
PROPOSED IS THE INSTALLATION OF AN 80,000 KILOWATT FIFTH GENERATING UNIT AT HARTWELL DAM LOCATED ON HARTWELL LAKE IN HART COUNTY, GEORGIA AND IN ANDERSON COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA. THE INSTALLATION WOULD INCLUDE MODIFICATION AND ADDITIONS TO THE EXISTING POWER INTAKE WORKS AND POWERHOUSE STRUCTURE DOWNSTREAM; ADDITION OF A TRANSFORMER AND TOWER ON THE TRANSFORMER DECK; AND OIL CIRCUIT BREAKERS, HIGH VOLTAGE BUS INSULATORS, DISCONNECT SWITCHES, TURNING TOWER, AND PULL-OFF TOWER AT THE SWITCHYARD. THE ORIGINAL DRAFT, #80302, FILED 3-29-78 WAS REPLACED BY REVISED DRAFT, #81177, FILED 10-30-78.
(SAVANNAH DISTRICT)
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA USDA HEW HUD AHP FERC
STATE AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90555)

PEABODY COAL COMPANY, PIT NO. 3 EXTENSION PERMIT 06/22

ILLINOIS
COUNTY: ST. CLAIR
THE PROPOSED ACTION INVOLVES THE ISSUANCE OF A PERMIT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF LEVEES, THE DRAINING, SURFACE MINING, AND RECLAIMING OF APPROXIMATELY 40 ACRES OF A BYPASSED CHANNEL AND ABOUT 200 ACRES OF LAND OF THE KASKASKIA NAVIGATION PROJECT AREA. PEABODY COAL COMPANY HAS BEEN ACTIVELY MINING COAL IN THE VICINITY OF NEW ATHENS ON THE KASKASKIA RIVER IN ST. CLAIR COUNTY, ILLINOIS SINCE THE EARLY 1960'S. PEABODY'S OPERATION, RIVER KING PIT #3 HAS PROGRESSED EASTWARD FROM THE VICINITY OF NEW ATHENS WITH THE NORTHERN LIMITS OF THE OPERATION BEING THE ORIGINAL CHANNEL OF THE KASKASKIA RIVER.
(ST. LOUIS DISTRICT)
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA DOI USDA DOT
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS, INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90626)

CAZENOVIA CREEK WATERSHED, FLOOD MANAGEMENT (2) 06/12

NEW YORK
COUNTY: ERIE
PROPOSED IS A FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT FOR THE CAZENOVIA CREEK WATERSHED LOCATED IN ERIE COUNTY, NEW YORK. NONSTRUCTURAL MEASURES INCLUDE FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT AND PARTICIPATION IN THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM. SUCH MEASURES ARE RECOMMENDED FOR REACHS 1 THROUGH 3, AREAS ALONG THE MAIN STEM OF CAZENOVIA CREEK BETWEEN THE ICE RETENTION STRUCTURE AND CONFLUENCE OF EAST AND WEST BRANCHES, TUNNERY BROOK, AND THE EAST AND WEST BRANCHES OF CAZENOVIA CREEK. THE DRAFT EIS CONCERNING THIS PROJECT, #41802, FILED 12-3-74 WAS REPLACED BY A REVISED DRAFT, #61181, FILED 8-12-76.
(DETROIT DISTRICT)

COMMENTS MADE BY: DOT USDA DOI EPA HUD HEW
STATE AGENCIES
GROUPS

(EIS ORDER # 90464)

FINAL DATE

WEST HARBOR RECREATIONAL NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT 06/11

OHIO
COUNTY: OHAWA
THE PROPOSED PLAN ENTAILS RECREATIONAL NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS FOR SMALL CRAFT AT WEST HARBOR, OHIO, CONSISTING OF BREAKWATER CONSTRUCTION AND CHANNEL DREDGING. BREAKWATER CONSTRUCTION WOULD OCCUR IN LAKE ERIE AT THE MOUTH OF THE NATURAL CHANNEL ENTRANCE TO THE HARBOR. DREDGING WOULD BE PERFORMED TO PROVIDE A DEEPENED CHANNEL FOR RECREATIONAL CRAFT EXTENDING FROM OFFSHORE IN LAKE ERIE THROUGH THE NATURAL CHANNEL AND INTO THE HARBOR. THIS PROJECT IS LOCATED IN OHAWA COUNTY.
(BUFFALO DISTRICT)

COMMENTS MADE BY: AHP FPC DOT DOI DOC
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90578)

STRUBE LAKE AND COUGAR ADDITIONAL UNIT, BLUE RIVER 06/19

OREGON
COUNTY: LANE
PROPOSED IS THE MODIFICATION OF THE EXISTING POWERHOUSE AT COUGAR DAM LOCATED IN LANE COUNTY, OREGON, TO ACCOMODATE A THIRD GENERATING UNIT OF 35,000 KW CAPACITY, MAKING A COMBINED TOTAL CAPACITY OF 60,000 KW. COUGAR GENERATING FACILITIES WOULD BE OPERATED FOR PEAKING, RATHER THAN CURRENT BASELOAD POWER GENERATION. TO RE-REGULATE FLOWS FROM COUGAR, STRUBE DAM WOULD BE CONSTRUCTED ABOUT 1.9 MILES DOWNSTREAM. A 4,600 KW GENERATING UNIT WOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE STRUBE POWERPLANT.
(PORTLAND DISTRICT)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOE FERC BPA EPA DOI USDA HUD
STATE AGENCIES
INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90610)

FINAL SUPPLEMENT DATE

BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECT, ANNA MARIA KEY 06/19

FLORIDA
COUNTY: MANATEE
PROPOSED IS THE RESTORATION AND MAINTENANCE OF 3.9 MILES OF BEACH ON ANNA MARIA KEY, MANATEE COUNTY, FLORIDA. CONSTRUCTION INVOLVES HYDRAULIC DREDGING OF SAND FROM THE OCEAN BOTTOM ABOUT 1,500 FEET OFFSHORE OF THE RESTORATION AREA. ADDITIONAL RESTORATION IS REQUIRED FOR A REACH OF SHORELINE 2,000 FEET SOUTHWARD FROM PASSAGE KEY INLET, AND A LOW PROFILE GROIN WOULD BE CONSTRUCTED TO STABILIZE THE SHORELINE AT THE NORTH END OF ANNA MARIA KEY. ABOUT 1.18 MILLION CUBIC YARDS WILL BE DREDGED FOR FILLING THE BRADENTON BEACH-HOLMES BEACH REACH.
(JACKSONVILLE DISTRICT)
(EIS ORDER # 90605)

DRAFT SUPPLEMENT

CEDAR RIVER LOCAL FLOOD PROTECTION, EVANSDALE 06/27

IOWA
COUNTY: BLACKHAWK
PROPOSED IS A LOCAL FLOOD PROTECTION PLAN FOR THE CITY OF EVANSDALE, BLACKHAWK COUNTY, IOWA. THE PLAN INVOLVES THE CONSTRUCTION OF EARTHERN LEVEES ALONG THE CEDAR RIVER AND BLACKHAWK CREEK AND WILL UTILIZE THE EMBANKMENT OF I-380 AS PART OF THE PROTECTION SYSTEM. TWO BORROW AREAS, TOTALING ABOUT 41 ACRES, WILL BE REQUIRED TO OBTAIN MATERIAL FOR LEVEE CONSTRUCTION. THE PROTECTIVE WORKS WILL BE ABOUT 3.2 MILES IN LENGTH. THERE WILL ALSO BE FOUR PONDING AREAS OF 11.0 ACRES, 2.8 ACRES, 6.0 ACRES, AND 4.0 ACRES.
(ROCK ISLAND DISTRICT)
(EIS ORDER # 90638)

FINAL SUPPLEMENT

CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, M/D (FS-1) 06/07

TEXAS
COUNTY: ARANSAS NUECES SAN PATRICIA
THIS STATEMENT SUPPLEMENTS FINAL EIS #60074, FILED 1-19-76. THE PROPOSED ACTION INVOLVES USE OF THE TULE LAKE AREA FROM THE TULE LAKE TURNING BASIN TO VIOLA TURNING BASIN FOR DISPOSAL OF DREDGED MATERIAL FROM MAINTENANCE OF THE CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TEXAS. THE PROJECT PROVIDES DEEP DRAFT NAVIGATION CHANNELS EXTENDING FROM THE GULF OF MEXI THROUGH A JETTIED ENTRANCE CHANNEL IN ARANSAS PASS TO A TURNING BASIN AT HARBOR ISLAND AND THENCE ACROSS CORPUS CRISTI BAY TO TURNING BASINS AT LA QUINTA, CORPUS CHRISTI, AVERY POINT, CHEMICAL, TULE LAKE, AND VIOLA. THIS PROJECT IS LOCATED IN ARANSAS, NUECES, AND SAN PATRICIA COUNTIES, TEXAS. (GALVESTON DISTRICT)
(EIS ORDER # 90569)

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

CONTACT: MR. STEVE ROTHENBURG
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD
1825 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20428
(202) 673-5205

FINAL DATE

CARIBBEAN AREA SERVICE INVESTIGATION, GRANT 06/14

PUERTO RICO
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF GRANTS FOR OPERATING AUTHORITY BETWEEN VARIOUS MAINLAND POINTS AND SAN JUAN TO ALL FIT, WILLING, AND ABLE APPLICANTS THAT HAVE PROPOSED SERVICE. THE PURPOSE OF THE ACTION IS TO IMPROVE THE QUANTITY AND THE QUALITY OF AIR SERVICE TO PUERTO RICO. SAN JUAN IS THE ONLY POINT THAT WILL BE SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECTED BY THIS ACTION.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOT EPA
STATE AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90588)

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

CONTACT: DR. SIDNEY R. GALLER
DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY
ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20230
(202) 377-4335

NAT'L OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMIN.

FINAL DATE

GUAM COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CZM) 06/22

GUAM
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF GRANT FUNDING FOR THE GUAM COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM. THE PROGRAM WILL INCLUDE: 1) A LAND-USE DISTRICTING SYSTEM, 2) RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR PROTECTION OF WETLANDS AND MANAGEMENT OF FLOOD HAZARD AREAS AS AREAS REQUIRING SPECIAL MANAGEMENT ATTENTION, AND 3) IMPLEMENTATION OF GUAM'S LAND USE POLICIES TO PROVIDE OVERALL GUIDANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT AND THE PEOPLE CONCERNING LAND AND WATER USAGE.
COMMENTS MADE BY: FERC EPA DOI USDA DOT USN COE HUD DOC LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90625)

DRAFT SUPPLEMENT DATE

SURF CLAM AND OCEAN QUAHOG INDUSTRIES, FMP (DS-2) 06/08

ATLANTIC OCEAN
THIS STATEMENT SUPPLEMENTS FINAL EIS #71292, FILED 10-17-77. PROPOSED IS AMENDMENT 2 TO THE SURF CLAM AND OCEAN QUAHOG FMP FOR THE NW ATLANTIC OCEAN. THIS EXTENDS THE CURRENT FMP THROUGH THE END OF CALENDAR YEAR 1980. THE FMP REMAINS IN THE EXISTING FORM WHICH INCLUDES: REBUILDING THE DECLINING SURF CLAM POPULATIONS; MINIMIZE SHORT-TERM ECONOMIC DISLOCATIONS TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE; AND PREVENT THE HARVEST OF OCEAN QUAHOG FROM EXCEEDING MAXIMUM SUSTAINABLE YIELD AND DIRECT THE FISHERY TOWARD MAINTAINING OPTIMUM YIELD.
(EIS ORDER # 90573)

FINAL SUPPLEMENT

ATLANTIC GROUNDFISH FMP, AMENDMENT (FS-3) 06/27

ATLANTIC OCEAN
THIS STATEMENT SUPPLEMENTS A FINAL EIS (#70722) FILED IN JUNE 1977. PROPOSED IS AN AMENDMENT TO THE ATLANTIC GROUNDFISH FMP CONCERNING THE OPTIMUM YIELDS BY THE APPROPRIATE AMOUNTS TO PROVIDE REVISED COMMERCIAL QUOTAS FOR THE FINAL QUARTER OF THE 1978-1979 FISHING YEAR. AN ADDITIONAL AMENDMENT TO THE FMP IS RECOMMENDED TO HELP SPREAD FISHING EFFORT MORE EVENLY THROUGHOUT THE FISHING YEAR. FOUR ALTERNATIVES ARE CONSIDERED.
(EIS ORDER # 90640)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, ARMY

CONTACT: COL. CHARLES E. SELL
CHIEF OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL OFFICE
HEADQUARTERS DAEN-ZCE
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF OF ENGINEERS
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
ROOM 1E676, PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20310
(202) 694-4269

DRAFT DATE

TRIPLER MEDICAL CENTER ADDITION/ALTERATION, OAHU 06/22

HAWAII
COUNTY: HONOLULU
PROPOSED IS THE HOSPITAL ADDITION AND ALTERATIONS TO THE TRIPLER ARMY MEDICAL CENTER LOCATED IN THE COUNTY OF HONOLULU, OAHU, HAWAII. THE PROJECT WILL INVOLVE THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW, 438,000-SQUARE FOOT HOSPITAL WING HOUSING MAJOR OUTPATIENT CLINICS, DIAGNOSTIC AND TREATMENT FACILITIES, AND SUPPLY DEPARTMENT; THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW, 24,000-SQUARE FOOT CENTRAL PLANT HOUSING CHILLERS, EMERGENCY GENERATORS, AND OTHER MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT; CONSTRUCTION AND REALIGNMENT OF ROADWAYS, PARKING AREAS, UTILITY LINES, AND OTHER SUPPORT FACILITIES TO SERVE THE NEW CONSTRUCTION OR ELIMINATE EXISTING DEFICIENCIES; AND THE RENOVATION AND STRUCTURAL UPGRADING OF WINGS WITHIN THE HOSPITAL.
(EIS ORDER # 90619)

FORT SILL TRAINING INSTALLATION, ONGOING MISSION 06/20

OKLAHOMA
COUNTY: COMANCHE
PROPOSED IS THE CONTINUED OPERATION OF THE FORT SILL TRAINING INSTALLATION LOCATED IN COMANCHE COUNTY, OKLAHOMA. THE ONGOING MISSION OF THE FACILITY IS TO SERVE AS THE US ARMY FIELD ARTILLERY CENTER WHICH TRAINS FIELD ARTILLERYMEN AND REPRESENTATIVES FROM ALLIED NATIONS. ACTIVE ARMY UNITS ARE ALSO STATIONED AT FORT SILL. THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED INCLUDE: 1) NO ACTION, 2) CHANGE OF MISSION, 3) ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LANDS, 4) REDUCTION OR RELOCATION OF SOME OPERATIONS UNPOST, AND 5) CLOSURE OF THE INSTALLATION AND RELOCATION OF OPERATIONS.
(EIS ORDER # 90611)

HAWAII ARMY INSTALLATIONS, ROUTINE OPERATIONS 06/11

PROGRAMMATIC HAWAII
PROPOSED IS THE CONTINUATION OF ROUTINE AND RECURRING TYPE OF OPERATIONS AT 35 US ARMY SUPPORT COMMAND (USASCH) INSTALLATIONS THROUGHOUT THE STATE OF HAWAII. THE ACTIVITIES CONSIDERED ARE: OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE; TRAINING; REAL ESTATE; PROCUREMENT; INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES; AND ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT. THIRTY INSTALLATIONS ARE LOCATED ON THE

ISLAND OF OAHU, FOUR ON THE ISLAND OF HAWAII, AND ONE ON THE ISLAND OF MAUI. FOUR MAJOR ALTERNATIVES ARE CONSIDERED: 1) RELOCATION OF THE 25TH INFANTRY DIVISION TO POHAKULOA TRAINING AREA; 2) ELIMINATION OF LIVE ORDNANCE TRAINING ON OAHU INSTALLATIONS; AND 3) THE TRANSFER OF ALL TRAINING TO POHAKULOA TRAINING AREA.
(EIS ORDER # 90580)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

CONTACT: DR. ROBERT STERN
ACTING DIRECTOR
NEPA AFFAIRS DIVISION
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
MAIL STATION E-201 GTN
WASHINGTON, DC 20545
(202) 376-5998

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

DRAFT SUPPLEMENT | DATE

OKANOGAN AREA SERVICE FACILITY, LOCATION (DS-2) 06/08

WASHINGTON
COUNTY: OKANOGAN DOUGLAS
THIS STATEMENT SUPPLEMENTS THE FINAL EIS ON THE BPA 1976 FISCAL YEAR PROGRAM, #50349, FILED 3-14-75. PROPOSED ARE FACILITY LOCATIONS FOR TRANSMISSION FACILITIES TO SERVE THE OKANOGAN VALLEY AREA OF OKANOGAN AND DOUGLAS COUNTIES, WASHINGTON. THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE EXTENDS FOR 63 MILES FROM THE CHIEF JOSEPH SUBSTATION IN OKANOGAN COUNTY TO THE TONASKET SUBSTATION IN DOUGLAS COUNTY.
(DOE/EIS-0048-DS-1)
(EIS ORDER # 90574)

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

EPA, HEADQUARTERS

DRAFT DATE

ATLANTIC OCEAN WASTE DISPOSAL SITE DESIGNATION 06/22

ATLANTIC OCEAN
PROPOSED IS THE DESIGNATION OF A 106-MILE CHEMICAL WASTE DISPOSAL SITE IN THE ATLANTIC OCEAN FOR CONTINUING USE. THE SITE IS LOCATED APPROXIMATELY ONE HUNDRED NAUTICAL MILES EAST OF CAPE MAY, NEW JERSEY, AND IS PRIMARILY USED BY INDUSTRIES LOCATED IN THE NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY-DELAWARE AREA. THE PURPOSE OF THE ACTION IS TO PROVIDE AN ENVIRONMENTALLY ACCEPTABLE AREA FOR THE DISPOSAL OF WASTES WHICH 1) COMPLY WITH EPA'S RIGID MARINE IMPACT CRITERIA, OR 2) MUST BE DISPOSED OF UNTIL A SUITABLE, LAND-BASED DISPOSAL METHOD IS AVAILABLE. THE ALTERNATIVES INCLUDE NO ACTION, AND THE USE OF OTHER SITES.
(EIS ORDER # 90620)

FINAL DATE

ELECTRIC UTILITY STEAM GENERATING UNITS, STANDARDS 06/15

REGULATORY
PROPOSED IS THE REVISION OF THE EXISTING NEW SOURCE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS LIMITING THE EMISSIONS OF SULFUR DIOXIDE FROM COAL-FIRED ELECTRIC UTILITY STEAM GENERATORS WHICH HAVE BEEN IN EFFECT SINCE DECEMBER 1971. REVISIONS TO THE NEW SOURCE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR THE EMISSION OF PARTICULATE MATTER AND OXIDES OF NITROGEN FROM COAL-FIRED ELECTRIC UTILITY STEAM GENERATORS ARE ALSO BEING PROPOSED. SEVERAL ALTERNATIVES, RANGING FROM THE RETENTION OF THE PRESENT STANDARD TO PROPOSING A VERY STRINGENT STANDARD, HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE EPA.
(EPA-450/3-79-021)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI TVA DOC DOE USDA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS, INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90594)

EPA, REGION 5

DRAFT DATE

RURAL LAKE WASTE TREATMENT SYSTEMS, CASE STUDY 1 06/29

MICHIGAN
COUNTY: BENZIE
PROPOSED IS A WASTE TREATMENT SYSTEM FOR THE CRYSTAL LAKE AREA IN BENZIE COUNTY, MICHIGAN. IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE EXISTING WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANTS IN THE AREA SHOULD BE

REPLACED, BUT THAT COMPLETE ABANDONMENT OF ON-SITE SYSTEMS IS UNJUSTIFIED. THIS ACTION WOULD INVOLVE: 1) CONSTRUCTION OF NEW SEWERS AND A NEW ROTATING BIOLOGICAL CONTACTOR TREATMENT PLANT; 2) SEWER SYSTEM EVALUATION SURVEY AND REHABILITATION OF SOME EXISTING SEWERS; 3) DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A SMALL WASTE FLOW DISTRICT; 4) SITE-SPECIFIC ANALYSES OF EXISTING ON-SITE SYSTEMS; 5) REPAIR AND REPLACEMENT OF ON-SITE SYSTEMS; AND 6) CLUSTER SYSTEMS OR OTHER OFF-SITE TREATMENT IN SOME SECTIONS.
(EIS ORDER # 90654)

DRAFT DATE

RURAL LAKE WASTE TREATMENT, CASE STUDY 2 06/21

MINNESOTA
COUNTY: KANDIYOHI
PROPOSED IS A WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLAN FOR THE GREEN LAKE SANITARY SEWER AND WATER DISTRICT LOCATED IN KANDIYOHI COUNTY, MINNESOTA. SEVEN ALTERNATIVES HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED WHICH EVALUATE ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION SYSTEMS (PRESSURE SEWERS), TREATMENT TECHNIQUES (LAND APPLICATION), INDIVIDUAL AND MULTI-FAMILY SEPTIC SYSTEMS (CLUSTER SYSTEMS), AND WATER CONSERVATION. THE GREEN LAKE STUDY AREA COMPRISES ABOUT 24 SQUARE MILES OF FIELDS, FARMS, WETLANDS, AND RESIDENTIAL/COMMERCIAL LAKE-SIDE DEVELOPMENT.
(EIS ORDER # 90614)

FINAL DATE

METROPOLITAN AREA WWT FACILITIES, COLUMBUS 06/08

OHIO
COUNTY: FRANKLIN
THE SUBJECT ACTION IS THE APPROVAL OF THE FACILITIES PLANS FOR THE CITY OF COLUMBUS IN FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO TO EXPAND AND UPGRADE WASTEWATER COLLECTION, TREATMENT, AND DISPOSAL FACILITIES WITHIN THE COLUMBUS METROPOLITAN AREA. THE PROPOSED PROJECT INCLUDES SELECTION OF ADDITIONAL LIQUID TREATMENT FACILITIES FOR SEWAGE PROCESSING; CONSTRUCTION OF TWO SLUDGE INCINERATORS AND DEWATERING FACILITIES; AND CONSTRUCTION OF SEPARATE SANITARY SEWER INTERCEPTORS.
(EPA-5-OH-FRANKLIN-COLUMBUS-WWTP+INT-79)

COMMENTS MADE BY: COE HEW DOI DOT
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
INDIVIDUALS
(EIS ORDER # 90575)

EPA, REGION 6

DRAFT DATE

WWT FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION GRANT, SANTA FE 06/22

NEW MEXICO
COUNTY: SANTA FE
PROPOSED IS THE AWARDING OF A GRANT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITIES OF 6 MGD CAPACITY NEAR AQUA FRIA VILLAGE IN SANTA FE COUNTY, NEW MEXICO. THE PROJECT INCLUDES: A TRICKLING FILTER PLANT FOR SECONDARY TREATMENT, THREE RESERVOIRS FOR STORAGE OF TREATED WASTEWATER, LAND APPLICATION SITE OF 900 ACRES WITH PROVISIONS FOR ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL ACREAGE, AN UNDERGROUND PIPELINE SYSTEM FOR DISTRIBUTION OF SECONDARY EFFLUENT ON THE CROPLAND AND A 30-INCH SEWER LINE.
(EIS ORDER # 90622)

FINAL DATE

FAYETTE POWER PROJECT, NPDES PERMIT 06/12

TEXAS
COUNTY: FAYETTE
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF A NPDES PERMIT FOR WASTEWATER DISCHARGE FROM THE FAYETTE POWER PROJECT IN THE COUNTY OF FAYETTE, TEXAS INTO CEDAR CREEK AND THE COLORADO RIVER. THE APPLICANT HAS INITIATED CONSTRUCTION ON A COAL-FIRED STEAM ELECTRIC STATION ON A SITE LOCATED SEVEN MILES FROM LA GRANGE. SOME FEATURES OF THE PROJECT INCLUDE: 1) TWO 600 MWE FOSSIL-FUELED STEAM ELECTRIC GENERATING UNITS, 2) ASSOCIATED COAL HANDLING AND STORAGE AREAS, AND 3) 121 MILES OF NEW OR WIDENED TRANSMISSION CORRIDOR.
COMMENTS MADE BY: FERC DOT DOI COE USDA
STATE AGENCIES
GROUPS
(EIS ORDER # 90579)

VISTRON PETROCHEMICAL COMPLEX, NDPES PERMIT 06/25

TEXAS
COUNTY: CALHOUN
PROPOSED IS A NPDES PERMIT FOR WASTEWATER DISCHARGE FROM THE VISTRON PETROCHEMICAL COMPLEX INTO THE VICTORIA BARGE CANAL, CALHOUN COUNTY, TEXAS. THE COMPLEX IS LOCATED ON A 2,300 ACRE SITE AND WILL CONSIST OF A BARGE DOCK, UTILITY SYSTEMS, AND STORAGE TANKS; AT FULL OPERATION 90,000 BARRELS OF HIGH-SULFUR CRUDE OIL AND 25 MILLION STANDARD CUBIC FEET OF NATURAL GAS WILL BE REQUIRED DAILY. THREE ALTERNATIVES ARE INCLUDED.
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA COE DOC DOI DOT
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90632)

EPA, REGION 7

DRAFT	DATE
DRY CREEK INTERCEPTOR, WICHITA	06/20

KANSAS
COUNTY: SEDGWICK

PROPOSED IS THE AWARDING OF A CONSTRUCTION GRANT FOR THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF AN INTERCEPTOR SEWER FOR THE CITY OF WICHITA, SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANSAS. THIS PROJECT WOULD REPLACE A PORTION OF THE DRY CREEK SANITARY SEWER DISTRICT INTERCEPTOR SEWER. THE ALTERNATIVES ARE: 1) CONSTRUCT THE DRY CREEK GRAVITY SEWER, 2) CONSTRUCT THE MT. VERNON GRAVITY SEWER TO TIE INTO THE DRY CREEK SEWER, 3) NO ACTION, AND 4) OTHERS.
(EPA-907/9-79-003)
(EIS ORDER # 90612)

EPA, REGION 9

DRAFT	DATE
SANTA CRUZ WASTEWATER FACILITIES PLAN, 201 GRANT	06/18

CALIFORNIA
COUNTY: SANTA CRUZ

PROPOSED IS A WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITIES PLAN FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA. THE SELECTED ALTERNATIVE WOULD PROVIDE OXYGEN-ACTIVATED SLUDGE SECONDARY TREATMENT AT NEARYS LAGOON PLANT SITE WITH YEAR ROUND DISCHARGE THROUGH AN EXTENDED OUTFALL TO THE PACIFIC OCEAN. ALL OF THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED MAINTAIN OCEAN DISCHARGE FROM THE SANTA CRUZ TREATMENT PLANT AND ALL UPGRADE TREATMENT TO AT LEAST SECONDARY TREATMENT.
(EPA-9-CA-SANTA CRUZ-WWTP-79)
(EIS ORDER # 90599)

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

CONTACT:
MR. CARL W. PENLAND
ACTING DIRECTOR
ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS DIVISION
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
18TH AND F STREETS, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20405
(202) 566-1416

DRAFT **DATE**

KEY WEST NAVAL AIR STATION, DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY 06/05

FLORIDA
COUNTY: MONROE
PROPOSED IS THE DISPOSITION BY GSA OF SURPLUS FEDERAL PROPERTIES AT THE NAVAL AIR STATION LOCATED AT KEY WEST, MONROE COUNTY, FLORIDA. THE ACTION WILL INCLUDE PORTIONS OF THE HARRY S. TRUMAN ANNEX AND TRUMBO POINT ANNEX. IT WILL ALSO INCLUDE THE FORMER COAST GUARD STATION AT THE NORTH END OF THE TRUMAN ANNEX. THE PROPERTIES INCLUDE APPROXIMATELY 123 ACRES OF LAND AND IMPROVEMENTS. THE MAJOR ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED INCLUDE: 1) NO ACTION OR DELAYED ACTION; 2) DISPOSITION ALTERNATIVES; AND 3) REUSE ALTERNATIVES.
(N-FLA-635-G-EIS-D-1)
(EIS ORDER # 90558)

DEPARTMENT OF HUD

CONTACT: MR. RICHARD H. BROUN, DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
ROOM 7274
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
451 7TH STREET, S.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20410
(202) 755-6306

DRAFT DATE

SINGLE FAMILY CONSTRUCTION APPLICATION PROCEDURES 06/22
POLICY
PROPOSED IS A MAJOR REVISION OF HUD HANDBOOK 4135.1, "PROCEDURES FOR APPROVAL OF SINGLE FAMILY PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION APPLICATIONS IN NEW SUBDIVISIONS," PROVIDING NEW PROCEDURES TO BE USED IN LIEU OF STANDARD SUBDIVISION ANALYSIS CONDUCTED BY HUD STAFF. THESE NEW PROCEDURES WOULD BE IMPLEMENTED THROUGH TWO MAJOR CHANGES WHICH ARE: 1) LOCAL AREA CERTIFICATION, AND 2) DEVELOPER CERTIFICATION. LOCAL AREA CERTIFICATION WILL BE ISSUED FOR LOCAL JURISDICTIONS WHICH HUD DETERMINES HAVE SUBDIVISION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CRITERIA AND CONTROLS ACCEPTABLE TO HUD. THE DEVELOPER CERTIFICATION PROCEDURE WILL BE USED IN NONCERTIFIED COMMUNITIES.
(EIS ORDER # 90615)

SUNBLEST SUBDIVISION, MORTGAGE INSURANCE, FISHERS 06/07

INDIANA
COUNTY: HAMILTON
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF HUD HOME MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR THE SUNBLEST SUBDIVISION LOCATED IN FISHERS, HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA. THE INSURANCE WILL APPLY TO THE INSTALLATION OF ALL INFRASTRUCTURE (SEWERS, WATER, ROADS) FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE FIRST 502 RESIDENTIAL BUILDING LOTS AND FOR THE ACQUISITION OF THE ENTIRE 658.99 ACRE TRACT. THE FINAL PROJECT WILL CONSIST OF 545.99 ACRES DEVELOPED FOR RESIDENTIAL USE AND 113 ACRES DEVELOPED FOR COMMERCIAL INDUSTRIAL USE.
(HUD-R05-EIS-78-07)
(EIS ORDER # 90566)

VILLAS DE LOIZA DEVELOPMENT, MORTGAGE INSURANCE 06/28

PUERTO RICO
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF HUD HOME MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR THE VILLAS DE LOIZA DEVELOPMENT LOCATED IN THE CANOVANAS WARD OF LOIZA, PUERTO RICO. THE DEVELOPMENT WILL ENCOMPASS 248.96 CUERDAS ON WHICH 2,080 RESIDENTIAL UNITS WILL BE CONSTRUCTED. THE DEVELOPER WILL PROVIDE THE PROJECT WITH A CULTURAL CENTER, PASSIVE AND ACTIVE PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS, COMMERCIAL SPACE, AND LAND FOR SCHOOLS, CHURCHES, AND OTHER PUBLIC USES.
(EIS ORDER # 90645)

DRAFT DATE

STEEPLECHASE SUBDIVISION, MORTGAGE INSURANCE 06/29

TEXAS
COUNTY: HARRIS
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF HUD HOME MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR THE STEEPLECHASE SUBDIVISION LOCATED IN HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS. THE SUBDIVISION IS LOCATED ON 1005 ACRES AND WILL CONTAIN APPROXIMATELY 15,700 RESIDENCES. THE PROJECT WILL ALSO CONTAIN SCHOOLS, AND SHOPPING AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES.
(HUD-R06-EIS-79-8D)
(EIS ORDER # 90653)

CASCADE PARK PLANNED COMMUNITY, MORTGAGE INSURANCE 06/25
WASHINGTON
COUNTY: CLARK
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF HUD MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR THE CASCADE PARK PLANNED COMMUNITY LOCATED NEAR VANCOUVER CITY, CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON. THE DEVELOPMENT WILL INCLUDE: 1) TWO ELECTRONICS MANUFACTURING SITES, 2) A BUSINESS AND HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL AREA OF 80 ACRES, 3) A RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY OF CLUSTERED NEIGHBORHOODS FOR SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING COMPRISING 2,800 ACRES, 4) PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, 5) PARK AND SCHOOL SITES ON 250 ACRES, AND 6) A LARGER CENTRAL PARK-NATURAL OPEN SPACE AREA OF 100 ACRES.
(HUD-R10-EIS-79-2D)
(EIS ORDER # 90628)

FINAL DATE

LEXINGTON SOUTH DEVELOPMENT, EAGAN 06/06

MINNESOTA
COUNTY: DAKOTA
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF HUD HOME MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR A PORTION OF THE LEXINGTON SOUTH DEVELOPMENT LOCATED IN EAGAN, DAKOTA COUNTY, MINNESOTA. THE AREA TO BE DEVELOPED ENCOMPASSES APPROXIMATELY 448 OF THE TOTAL 1,108 ACRE LEXINGTON SITE. THIS EIS DISCUSSES THE CUMULATIVE IMPACTS OF LEXINGTON SOUTH AND A RELATED, NEARBY DEVELOPMENT KNOWN AS BLACKHAWK PARK FOR WHICH A SEPARATE EIS WILL BE PREPARED.
(HUD-R05-EIS-78-12-(F))
COMMENTS MADE BY: COE AHP EPA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90561)

BLACKHAWK PARK PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, EAGAN 06/06

MINNESOTA
COUNTY: DAKOTA
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF HUD HOME MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR

THE BLACKHAWK PARK PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT LOCATED IN EAGAN, DAKOTA COUNTY, MINNESOTA. THE INSURANCE WILL APPLY TO 542 ACRES OF THE 603 ACRE SITE WHICH WILL BE DEVELOPED TO PROVIDE A MIXTURE OF LAND USES AND HOUSING TYPES.
(HUD-R05-78-14-(F))
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOC DOT AHP DOI EPA
STATE AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90562)

FINAL DATE

HERBERT C. HUBER SUBDIVISION, WAYNE TOWNSHIP 06/13

OHIO
COUNTY: MONTGOMERY
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF HUD HOME MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR THE HERBERT C. HUBER RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN WAYNE TOWNSHIP, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, OHIO. THE DEVELOPMENT WILL ENCOMPASS APPROXIMATELY 643.6 ACRES AND WHEN COMPLETED WILL INCLUDE 2,038 SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED HOUSING UNITS. LAND WITHIN THE DEVELOPMENT HAS BEEN SET ASIDE FOR SCHOOLS, OPEN SPACE, AND A FIRE STATION.
(HUD-R05-EIS-78-08-(F))
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA DOI EPA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90583)

SAGE BLUFFS RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, GILLETE 06/14

WYOMING
COUNTY: CAMPBELL
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF HUD HOME MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR THE SAGE BLUFFS RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, GILLETE, CAMPBELL COUNTY, WYOMING. THE SUBDIVISION, WHEN COMPLETED, WILL CONSIST OF 926 DWELLING UNITS INCLUDING BOTH SINGLE-FAMILY AND MULTIFAMILY DWELLING UNITS. THE DEVELOPMENT, LOCATED ON APPROXIMATELY 317 ACRES, WILL ALSO INCLUDE SCHOOL, OPEN AND PARK SPACE.
(HUD-R08-EIS-79-14F)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI EPA HEW USDA COE
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90586)

WRIGHT PLANNED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, WRIGHT 06/28

WYOMING
COUNTY: CAMPBELL
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF HUD HOME MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR A PLANNED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN WRIGHT, CAMPBELL COUNTY, WYOMING. THE DEVELOPMENT WILL ULTIMATELY ACCOMODATE 1,800-2000 HOUSING UNITS OF ALL TYPES FOR AN EVENTUAL POPULATION OF 6,000-6,500 PEOPLE. ALSO INCLUDED WILL BE TWO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SITES, ONE JUNIOR-SENIOR SCHOOL SITE, AND SEVERAL CHURCH SITES.
(HUD-R08-EIS-79X111F)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA COE HEW DOI EPA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90646)

FINAL SUPPLEMENT DATE

NEWFIELDS NEW COMMUNITY, TERMINATION, DAYTON FS 06/15

OHIO
COUNTY: MONTGOMERY
THIS STATEMENT SUPPLEMENTS A FINAL EIS FILED WITH CEQ ON JUNE 19, 1973 (EIS #31028). THE PROPOSED ACTION IS A DETERMINATION THAT THE CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEWFIELDS COMMUNITY LOCATED NEAR DAYTON, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, OHIO, AS A TITLE VII NEW COMMUNITY IS INFEASIBLE AND WOULD POSE AN UNJUSTIFIABLE FINANCIAL RISK. HUD, THEREFORE, RECOMMENDS THE FOLLOWING ACTION: 1) TERMINATE TITLE VII STATUS, 2) ACQUISITION OF THE PROPERTY THRU FORECLOSURE, 3) IMPLEMENTATION OF PLANNED DISPOSITION, AND 4) OTHER ACTIONS WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE OVERALL SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA DOT HUD DOI USDA FERC COE
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90595)

SECTION 104 (H)

DRAFT DATE

CAPITOL CENTRE REDEVELOPMENT, MADISON 06/27

WISCONSIN
COUNTY: DANE
PROPOSED IS THE AWARDING OF HUD CDBG FUNDS FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF 4.4 ACRES, TO BE KNOWN AS CAPITOL CENTRE, DOWNTOWN MADISON, DANE COUNTY, WISCONSIN. THE AREA NOW EXISTS AS TWO GRADE-LEVEL PARKING LOTS. THE REDEVELOPMENT WOULD PROVIDE UNSUBSIDIZED HOUSING, SUBSIDIZED HOUSING FOR ELDERLY AND HANDICAPPED PERSONS, A SENIOR CITIZENS' CENTER, RETAIL SPACE, OPEN SPACE, AND PARKING RAMPS. THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE IS CONSIDERED.
(EIS ORDER # 90642)

HIGH SERVICE TRANSMISSION MAIN, ALEXANDER CITY 06/04

ALABAMA
COUNTY: TALLAPOOSA
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF CDBG FUNDS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A WATER MAIN TO CONNECT THE PROPOSED NEW WATER TREATMENT FACILITY NEAR LAKE MARTIN, TO THE PRESENTLY EXISTING ALEXANDER CITY WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM. THE WATER MAIN WILL BE OF ADEQUATE SIZE TO PROVIDE THE HOUSEHOLDS, BUSINESSES, AND INDUSTRIES IN ALEXANDER CITY, TALLAPOOSA COUNTY, ALABAMA WITH SUFFICIENT POTABLE WATER FOR THEIR DAILY NEEDS AND WILL ALSO PROVIDE FIRE PROTECTION. THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED INCLUDE: 1) NO ACTION, 2) ENLARGEMENT OF PRESENT FACILITIES, AND 3) CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FACILITIES WITH A NEW SOURCE OF SUPPLY.
(HUD-8-78-NH-01-0001)
(EIS ORDER # 90557)

DRAFT DATE

CADILLAC CENTER, CONSTRUCTION (CDBG) 06/29

MICHIGAN
COUNTY: WAYNE
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF CDBG FUNDING FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE CADILLAC CENTER TO BE LOCATED IN THE DOWNTOWN RETAIL CORE OF THE CITY OF DETROIT, WAYNE COUNTY, MICHIGAN. THE CENTER WILL BE A MAJOR REGIONAL SHOPPING CENTER HOUSING THREE DEPARTMENT STORES AND APPROXIMATELY 100 RETAIL OR SERVICE-ORIENTED SHOPS. IN ADDITION TO NO ACTION, TWO ALTERNATIVES ARE CONSIDERED WHICH VARY IN THE LOCATION OF THE J.L. HUDSON COMPANY DEPARTMENT STORE.
(EIS ORDER # 90656)

FINAL DATE

PORT/MARINA DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, RICHMOND 06/22

CALIFORNIA
COUNTY: CONTRA COSTA
PROPOSED IS A MARINA/PORT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT WHICH ENCOMPASSES 965 ACRES WITHIN A REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT LOCATED IN RICHMOND, CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE MARINA PORTION OF THE PLAN INCLUDES A 2,000 BERTH MARINA FOR SMALL BOATS; 2,000-4,000 NEW RESIDENTIAL UNITS; NEW COMMERCIAL USES; PARKING; AND A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF RECREATIONAL CONTAINER BERTHS. PORT DEVELOPMENT INCLUDES A SUPPORT AREA AND THE INTERFACING OF RAIL, WATER AND LAND TRANSPORTATION.
(SCH #78071113)
COMMENTS MADE BY: COE DOI EPA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90623)

SOUTH END URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT, BOSTON 06/13

MASSACHUSETTS
COUNTY: SUFFOLK
PROPOSED IS AN URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT FOR THE SOUTH END OF THE CITY OF BOSTON, SUFFOLK COUNTY, MASSACHUSETTS. THE REMAINING ACTIVITIES TO BE CARRIED OUT INCLUDE THE CONVEYANCE OF 112 PARCELS OF LAND FOR REDEVELOPMENT AND VARIOUS PROJECT IMPROVEMENTS. THE 112 PARCELS MAY BE CONVEYED SUBJECT TO THE CONTROLS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE MODIFIED PLAN; ENTIRELY OR PARTIALLY DELETED FROM ACQUISITION; OR WITH MODIFIED OR ALTERED PLANS FOR REUSE.
(HUD-ROI-EIS-79-01-F)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOT EPA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS
(EIS ORDER # 90584)

CHARLESTON CENTER, REDEVELOPMENT 06/29

SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY: CHARLESTON
PROPOSED IS A MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR CHARLESTON CENTER IN CHARLESTON COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA. THE PLAN WILL CONSIST OF HOTEL/COMMERCIAL/CONVENTION FACILITIES AND PARKING. THE PROJECT, WHICH IS LOCATED ON 8.5 ACRES IN THE LOWER PENINSULA OF CHARLESTON CITY, ALSO INCLUDES IMPROVEMENTS OF: THE ADJACENT AREA, STREET SYSTEM, AND RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE. THE CITY OF CHARLESTON WITHDREW THE DRAFT EIS, #80862, FILED 8-10-78. A NEW DRAFT EIS ON THE PROJECT, #90068, WAS FILED BY HUD ON 1-18-79.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOC DOI HEW EPA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS, INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90649)

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

CONTACT: MR. BRUCE BLANCHARD
DIRECTOR, ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REVIEW
ROOM 4256 INTERIOR BLDG.
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240
(202) 343-3891

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

DRAFT DATE

THREE CORNERS AREA GRAZING MANAGEMENT 06/06

COLORADO UTAH
COUNTY: SWEETWATER UNITAH DAGGETT
PROPOSED IS A GRAZING MANAGEMENT PROGRAM FOR 190,536 ACRES OF PUBLIC LANDS IN THE THREE CORNERS PLANNING UNIT LOCATED IN SWEETWATER COUNTY, COLORADO AND UNITAH AND DAGGETT COUNTIES, UTAH. THE PLAN INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING AUM ALLOCATIONS: 15,788 FOR CATTLE, 3,655 FOR SHEEP, 9,684 FOR DEER, 4,838 FOR ELK, AND 378 FOR ANTELOPE. THE PLAN ALSO PROPOSES TO: RESERVE ONE ALLOTMENT FOR BIG GAME USE, CONTINUE PRESENT ALLOTMENT-WIDE GRAZING ON 17 ALLOTMENTS, CONTINUE IMPROVED MANAGEMENT ON FOUR ALLOTMENTS WITH EXISTING AMPS, AND IMPLEMENT IMPROVED MANAGEMENT ON 17 ALLOTMENTS. OTHER DEVELOPMENTS INCLUDE: 30 MILES OF FENCING, 52 WATER DEVELOPMENTS, AND 1,620 ACRES OF SAGE BRUSH CONTROL. (DES-79-32) (EIS ORDER # 90565)

SNAKE R. BIRDS OF PREY NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA 06/29

IDAHO
COUNTY: SEVERAL
PROPOSED IS THE DESIGNATION OF 515,257 ACRES OF LAND AS THE SNAKE RIVER BIRDS OF PREY NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA LOCATED IN ADA, CANYON, ELMORE AND OWYHEE COUNTIES, IDAHO. IT HAS ALSO BEEN RECOMMENDED THAT THESE LANDS BE REMOVED FROM MINERAL ENTRY UNDER THE 1872 MINING LAW; THAT THESE LANDS BE REMOVED FROM APPLICATION UNDER THE DESERT LAND, CAREY, AND THE STATE OF IDAHO ADMISSIONS ACT; AND THAT LEASES UNDER THE MINERAL LEASING OR GEOTHERMAL STREAM ACT BE ALLOWED ONLY AS PROVIDED FOR IN A LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN TO BE DEVELOPED UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF THE FEDERAL LAND POLICY AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1976.
(DES-79-36)
(EIS ORDER # 90651)

DRAFT DATE

EAST ROSWELL GRAZING MANAGEMENT PROGRAM 06/06

NEW MEXICO
COUNTY: CHAVES LEA EDDY
PROPOSED IS THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE EAST ROSWELL AREA LOCATED IN CHAVES, LEA AND EDDY COUNTIES, NEW MEXICO. THE PLAN WOULD: EXCLUDE APPROXIMATELY 6,600 ACRES FROM LIVESTOCK GRAZING; ALLOCATE 168,111 AUMS OF FORAGE TO LIVESTOCK AND 2,893 AUMS TO BIG GAME ANIMALS; SET A MAXIMUM FORAGE UTILIZATION-LEVEL OF 40 TO 60 PERCENT; TREAT APPROXIMATELY 54,300 ACRES WITH CHEMICALS TO CONTROL BRUSH; DEVELOP GRAZING MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS; AND SPECIFY LIVESTOCK FACILITIES NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT SYSTEMS.
(DES-79-30)
(EIS ORDER # 90563)

RANDOLPH PLANNING UNIT GRAZING MANAGEMENT PLAN 06/06

UTAH
COUNTY: RICH
PROPOSED ARE LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT PLANS FOR THE RANDOLPH PLANNING UNIT IN RICH COUNTY, UTAH. THE PURPOSE IS TO PROVIDE FOR THE 140,298 ACRES, SUSTAINED, LONG TERM, PRODUCTIVE USE OF NATURAL RESOURCES WHICH WILL BE ACCOMPLISHED IN TWO PHASES. THE FIRST PHASE INCLUDES: ALLOCATION OF 22,350 AUMS OF LIVESTOCK FORAGE ON 19 ALLOTMENTS; ALLOTMENT-WIDE CONTINUOUS GRAZING AUTHORIZED ON 15 ALLOTMENTS; AND UNCHANGED GRAZING MANAGEMENT ON 4 ALLOTMENTS. THE SECOND PHASE INCLUDES AN INCREASE OF LIVESTOCK FORAGE ON A SUSTAINED BASIS TO 35,241 AUMS AND LONG TERM MANAGEMENT CONSISTING OF LIVESTOCK GRAZING, VEGETATION TREATMENTS, FENCES, WATER DEVELOPMENTS, AND CATTLEGUARDS. (DES-79-31)
(EIS ORDER # 90564)

FINAL DATE

OCS OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE, NO. 58A, GULF OF MEXICO 06/28

GULF OF MEXICO
PROPOSED IS AN OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE IN THE WESTERN AND CENTRAL GULF OF MEXICO WHICH INCLUDES 122 TRACTS LOCATED ON THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF IN FEDERAL WATERS OFFSHORE OF THE STATES OF TEXAS, LOUISISANA, MISSISSIPPI, AND ALABAMA. THESE PROPOSED TRACTS COMPRISE APPROXIMATELY 582,529.75 ACRES RANGING FROM 3-165 NAUTICAL MILES FROM SHORE IN WATER DEPTHS OF 6-500 METERS. APPROXIMATELY 57% OF THE TRACTS ARE GAS PRONE, 39% ARE OIL PRONE, AND 40% ARE BOTH OIL AND GAS PRONE.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOC USAF COE USN DOE FERC HEW DOI DOT NRC EPA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90647)

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

DRAFT DATE

COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON WINDY GAP PROJECT 06/18

COLORADO
COUNTY: GRAND LARIMER
PROPOSED IS THE COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON WINDY GAP PROJECT, THE PROJECT LOCATED IN THE STATE OF COLORADO WITH CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES LOCATED IN GRAND AND LARIMER COUNTIES. THE PROPOSAL INVOLVES THREE ACTIONS: 1) A CHANGE IN OPERATION OF THE EXISTING PROJECT; 2) CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A DIVERSION DAM ON THE COLORADO RIVER, A PUMPING PLANT, AND A 5-MILE CONDUIT TO GRANBY RESERVOIR; AND 3) CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A 750-MEGAWATT COAL-FIRED POWER PLANT. AN ANNUAL AVERAGE OF 48,900 ACRE-FEET WILL BE DIVERTED FROM THE COLORADO RIVER.
(INT-DES-79-33)
(EIS ORDER # 90602)

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

FINAL DATE

MAMMALIAN PREDATOR DAMAGE MANAGEMENT, LIVESTOCK 06/27

SEVERAL:
COUNTY: SEVERAL
PROPOSED IS A PREDATOR DAMAGE CONTROL PROGRAM AS PRESENTLY CONDUCTED IN THE STATES OF ARIZONA, CALIFORNIA, COLORADO, IDAHO, MONTANA, NEBRASKA, NEVADA, NEW MEXICO, NORTH DAKOTA, OREGON, OKLAHOMA, SOUTH DAKOTA, TEXAS, UTAH, WASHINGTON, AND WYOMING. THE PREDATOR SPECIES CONTROLLED INCLUDE COYOTE, BOBCAT, MOUNTAIN LION, BEAR AND FOX. THESE ANIMALS ARE CONTROLLED PRIMARILY TO ALLEVIATE DAMAGES CAUSED BY PREDATORS TO DOMESTIC ANIMALS. THE PROGRAM IS CONDUCTED ON A REQUEST BASIS WHICH INITIATES AN INVESTIGATION AND IF WARRANTED, THE REMOVAL OF THE PREDATOR. PRECAUTIONS ARE TAKEN TO PROTECT HUMANS AND DOMESTIC ANIMALS FROM THE TOXICANTS OR DEVICES USED.
(FES-79-25)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USAF USN USDA USA DOI HEW EPA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS, INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES

(EIS ORDER # 90641)

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

DRAFT DATE

GREAT SMOKEY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK, GENERAL MGMT 06/20

NORTH CAROLINA TENNESSEE
COUNTY: SEVERAL
PROPOSED IS A GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE GREAT SMOKEY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK LOCATED IN THE COUNTIES OF SWAIN, HAYWOOD, GRAHAM AND JACKSON, NORTH CAROLINA, AND THE COUNTIES OF SEVIER, COCKE AND BLOUNT, TENNESSEE. THE PLAN INCLUDES THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FACILITIES AT 16 LOCATIONS, 58 MILES OF NEW ROADS, AND 21 MILES OF TRAILS; THE CLOSURE OF ONE PRIMITIVE CAMPGROUND; THE ELIMINATION OF VEHICULAR ACCESS OF 21 MILES OF PRIMITIVE ROADS; AND MANAGEMENT OF PARK LANDS, VEGETATION, WILDLIFE, AND CULTURAL OBJECTS FOR VISITOR USE AND RESOURCE PROTECTION.
(DES-79-34)
(EIS ORDER # 90613)

SNAKE RIVER, WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY 06/22

WASHINGTON IDAHO OREGON
COUNTY: SEVERAL
PROPOSED IS THE INCLUSION OF A 33 MILE SEGMENT OF THE SNAKE RIVER, BORDERING THE STATES OF WASHINGTON, IDAHO AND OREGON, IN THE NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM. THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: 1) NO ACTION, 2) FULL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT, 3) 29 MILES PROTECTED BY COUNTIES, 4) 29 MILES PROTECTED BY STATES, 5) 33 MILES BE ADDED TO THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM, 6) PROTECTION OF ARCHEOLOGICAL/HISTORIC SITES BY THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, 7) INCLUSION OF THE UPPER 11 MILES IN THE SYSTEM, AND 8) INCLUSION OF THE UPPER 4 MILES INTO THE SYSTEM.
(DES-79-35)
(EIS ORDER # 90618)

FINAL DATE

GLEN CANYON NAT'L RECREATION AREA, MANAGEMENT 06/22

ARIZONA UTAH
COUNTY: SEVERAL
PROPOSED IS A GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN AND PRELIMINARY WILDERNNESS PROPOSAL FOR THE GLEN CANYON NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, ARIZONA AND UTAH. THE GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN CONSISTS OF A MANAGEMENT ZONING PROPOSAL DIVIDING THE RECREATION AREA INTO FOUR MANAGEMENT ZONES: NATURAL (50%), RECREATION AND RESOURCE UTILIZATION (48%), CULTURAL (LESS THAN 0.1%), AND DEVELOPMENT (ALMOST 2%).
COMMENTS MADE BY: AHP USDA COE DOE HUD DOI DOT FPC
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90627)

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

CONTACT: MR. CARL BAUSCH, CHIEF
SECTION OF ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION
ROOM 3371
12TH & CONSTITUTION AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20423
(202) 275-7692

DRAFT DATE

DISCONTINUANCE OF CONRAIL OPERATION 06/15

INDIANA ILLINOIS

PROPOSED IS THE DISCONTINUANCE OF THE OPERATION OF CONSOLIDATED RAIL CORPORATION (CONRAIL) PASSENGER TRAINS, NOS. 453 THRU 456, BETWEEN VALPARAISO, INDIANA AND CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. THE TOTAL DISTANCE IS 44 MILES. IF DISCONTINUANCE IS AUTHORIZED, A MASS TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM IN NORTHWEST INDIANA WILL BE ELIMINATED. THE APPLICANT IS CONTEMPLATING THE ELIMINATION OF FREIGHT SERVICE ALSO. THE ALTERNATIVES INCLUDE: 1) DENIAL, 2) PARTIAL DISCONTINUANCE, 3) FUNDING OR CONTINUED OPERATION BY OTHERS, 4) FARE INCREASE, 5) STREAMLINE OPERATIONS, AND 6) IMPROVED SERVICE.
(DOCKET NO. 29021F)
(EIS ORDER # 90597)

CONTACT: MR. VOSS A. MOORE
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
P-518
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555
(301) 492-8446

DRAFT	DATE
SUSQUEHANNA STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2	06/28

PENNSYLVANIA
COUNTY: LUZERNE

PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF OPERATING LICENSES FOR START-UP AND OPERATION OF THE SUSQUEHANNA STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2 LOCATED ON THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER IN LUZERNE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA. THE FACILITY WILL EMPLOY TWO BOILING-WATER REACTORS AND WILL PRODUCE UP TO 3293 MWT PER UNIT. TWO STEAM TURBINE-GENERATORS WILL USE THIS HEAT TO PROVIDE UP TO 1085 MWE OF ELECTRICAL CAPACITY PER UNIT. THE EXHAUST STEAM WILL BE CONDENSED BY WATER COOLED IN NATURAL-DRAFT COOLING TOWERS; MAKE-UP AND BLOWDOWN WILL BE TAKEN FROM AND DISCHARGED TO THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER.
(NUREG-0564)
(EIS ORDER # 90643)

VIRGIL C. SUMMER NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT NO. 1	06/29

SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY: FAIRFIELD

PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF AN OPERATING LICENSE FOR THE VIRGIL C. SUMMER NUCLEAR STATION UNIT 1 LOCATED IN FAIRFIELD COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA. UNIT 1 EMPLOYS A PRESSURIZED-WATER REACTOR PRODUCING UP TO 2775 MWT. A STEAM TURBINE-GENERATOR WILL USE THIS HEAT TO PROVIDE 900 MW OF ELECTRIC POWER CAPACITY. THE PLANT SITE IS ADJACENT TO MONTICELLO RESERVOIR, A 6800 ACRE RESERVOIR CREATED BY THE APPLICANT AS PART OF A PUMPED STORAGE HYDROELECTRIC STATION.
(NUREG-0534)
(EIS ORDER # 90652)

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

CONTACT: MR. MARTIN CONVISSER, DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
400 7TH STREET, S.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590
(202) 426-4357

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

DRAFT DATE

LAMBERT-ST. LOUIS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, ST. LOUIS 06/15

MISSOURI
COUNTY: ST.LOUIS
PROPOSED ARE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE LAMBERT-ST. LOUIS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI. THE IMPROVEMENTS INCLUDE THE EXTENSION OF RUNWAY 12L-30R FOR 2,500 FEET TO THE EAST, EXTENSION OF RUNWAY 12R-30L FOR 1,000 FEET TO THE EAST, CONSTRUCTION OF ASSOCIATED TAXIWAYS AND LANDING AIDS, REALIGNMENT OF LINDBERGH BOULEVARD, AND RELOCATION OF BROWN ROAD, FUTURE TERMINAL AND AIR CARGO FACILITY DEVELOPMENT. THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED INCLUDE RUNWAY AND HIGHWAY ALIGNMENTS, USE OF OTHER MODES OF TRANSPORTATION, OPERATIONAL ALTERNATIVES AND THE DO-NOTHING ALTERNATIVE.
(EIS ORDER # 90598)

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

DRAFT DATE

FL-525, LAKEWOOD CIRCUMFERENTIAL ROUTE 06/28

FLORIDA
COUNTY: POLK
PROPOSED IS THE CONSTRUCTION OF FL-525 LAKEWOOD CIRCUMFERENTIAL ROUTE FROM I-4 WEST TO I-4 NORTHEAST OF THE CITY OF LAKEWOOD LOCATED IN POLK COUNTY, FLORIDA. THE PROJECT INVOLVES THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 22 MILE LOOP AROUND THE CITY OF LAKEWOOD. FROM I-4 WEST OF LAKEWOOD TO US 98 SOUTHEAST OF THE CITY, THE PROJECT WOULD BE CONSTRUCTED AS A RURAL FOUR-LANE CONTROLLED ACCESS ARTERIAL. FROM US 98 NORTHWARD, THE PROPOSED ROADWAY WOULD BE AN URBAN, OR MUNICIPAL FOUR-LANE DIVIDED ARTERIAL. APPROXIMATELY TWO-THIRDS OF THE PROPOSED FACILITY WOULD BE ON A NEW ALIGNMENT.
(FHWA-FLA-EIS-78-2-D)
(EIS ORDER # 90644)

DRAFT DATE

SOUTH STONY ISLAND AVENUE IMPROVEMENT 06/29

ILLINOIS
COUNTY: COOK
PROPOSED IS THE RECONSTRUCTION, WIDENING, AND CHANNELIZING OF SOUTH STONY ISLAND AVENUE BETWEEN EAST 64TH STREET TO EAST 70TH STREET IN THE CITY OF CHICAGO, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS. THE PROPOSED LIMITS OF CONSTRUCTION ENCOMPASS A DISTANCE OF 3,367 FEET, AND WILL RESULT IN WIDENING SOUTH STONY ISLAND AVENUE TO FOUR FULL LANES IN EACH DIRECTION WITH MEDIANS AND TURN BAYS. ALSO INCLUDED IN THE PROJECT ARE SIGNALIZATION, LANDSCAPING, RAMPED PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS, AND STREET LIGHTING. IN ADDITION TO NO ACTION, THREE ALTERNATIVES ARE CONSIDERED.
(FHWA-ILL-EIS-79-01-D)
(EIS ORDER # 90655)

MD-115, MONTGOMERY VILLAGE AVENUE TO NORBECK 06/18

MARYLAND
COUNTY: MONTGOMERY
PROPOSED IS THE CONSTRUCTION OF 8 MILES OF ARTERIAL HIGHWAY, MD-115, FROM MONTGOMERY VILLAGE AVENUE TO NORBECK IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND. ALL ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS BEGIN WITH AN INTERSECTION AT MONTGOMERY VILLAGE AVENUE AND EXTEND EASTERLY AS A 4-LANE DUAL HIGHWAY ON NEW LOCATION TO MD-124. THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDER RELOCATION OR RECONSTRUCTION. THE RELOCATION WILL CONSIST OF A 4 OR 6-LANE DUAL HIGHWAY FROM LAYTONSVILLE ROAD, EAST TO MD-609. RECONSTRUCTION WOULD INVOLVE UPGRADING THE ROADWAY GENERALLY ALONG THE EXISTING ALIGNMENT.
(FHWA-MD-EIS-79-02-D)
(EIS ORDER # 90603)

I-395 EXTENSION, BANGOR TO BREWER 06/25

MAINE
COUNTY: PENOBSCOT
PROPOSED IS THE EXTENSION OF I-395 FROM ITS PRESENT TERMINUS AT MAIN STREET IN BANGOR EASTERLY TO A NEW TERMINUS AT US 1A IN BREWER, ALL WITHIN THE COUNTY OF PENOBSCOT, MAINE. THE PROJECT VARIES FROM 2.7 TO 3.6 MILES IN LENGTH DEPENDING ON THE ALTERNATIVE SELECTED. THE FACILITY WILL BE A FOUR-LANE DIVIDED HIGHWAY, WITH FULL CONTROL OF ACCESS. THE INTERCHANGE AT MAIN STREET IN BANGOR WILL BE MODIFIED, WITH NEW ACCESS RAMPS CONSTRUCTED. IN BREWER, FULL SERVICE INTERCHANGES WILL BE PROVIDED AT SOUTH MAIN STREET, PARKWAY SOUTH AND US 1A. THE PLAN ALSO INCLUDES A NEW BRIDGE ACROSS THE PENOBSCOT RIVER.
(FHWA-ME-EIS-79-01-D)
(EIS ORDER # 90629)

DRAFT

DATE

MI-32, RELOCATION OR RECONSTRUCTION 06/18

MICHIGAN
COUNTY: MONTMORENCY
PROPOSED IS THE RECONSTRUCTION OR RELOCATION OF APPROXIMATELY 15.5 MILES OF MI-32 IN MONTMORENCY COUNTY, MICHIGAN. THE PROJECT BEGINS ONE MILE EAST OF THE MI-32/33 JUNCTION IN ATLANTA TO THE MONTMORENCY/ALPENA COUNTY LINE. IT IS PROPOSED THAT THE ROADWAY WILL BE CONSTRUCTED TO A 24-FOOT PAVEMENT WITHIN A MINIMUM 150 FOOT RIGHT-OF-WAY. THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED ARE: 1) DO NOTHING, 2) NO-BUILD (LOW CAPITAL EXPENDITURE), 3) ALTERNATE MODES OF TRANSPORTATION, AND 4) RECONSTRUCTION OR RELOCATION OF EXISTING MI-32.
(FHWA-MI-EIS-79-01-D)
(EIS ORDER # 90601)

ALLEN BLVD., MURRY BLVD. TO ALICE LANE, BEAVERTON 06/22

OREGON
COUNTY: WASHINGTON
PROPOSED IS THE IMPROVEMENT OF ALLEN BOULEVARD FROM SW MURRY BOULEVARD TO SW ALICE LANE IN WASHINGTON COUNTY, OREGON. THE PROJECT LENGTH IS 1.5 MILES. IN ADDITION TO NO-BUILD, TWO ALTERNATIVES ARE CONSIDERED. ALTERNATIVE A WIDENS THE EXISTING TWO-LANE FACILITY TO A FOUR-LANE FACILITY WITH A 66-FOOT TO 72-FOOT RIGHT-OF-WAY. ALTERNATIVE B IS A MINIMUM -BUILD ALTERNATIVE WHICH WOULD OVERLAY THE EXISTING STREET AND WIDEN IT ONLY AT MAJOR INTERSECTIONS.
(FHWA-OR-EIS-79-06D)
(EIS ORDER # 90621)

I-5, JANTZEN BEACH-DELTA PARK INTERCHANGE 06/25

OREGON
COUNTY: MULTNOMAH
PROPOSED IS THE UPGRADING OF I-5 (PACIFIC HIGHWAY) BETWEEN THE JANTZEN-BEACH-DELTA PARK INTERCHANGES IN MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON. THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDER NO ACTION AND TWO BUILD ALTERNATIVES WHICH HAVE SOME FEATURES IN COMMON SUCH AS: 1) SEPARATING I-5 NORTHBOUND TRAFFIC MOVEMENTS GOING TO UNION AVENUE/WEST MARINE DRIVE FROM DENVER AVENUE TO NORTHBOUND I-5 TRAFFIC, 2) REPLACING THE EXISTING OREGON SLOUGH BRIDGE WITH AN EIGHT LANE FACILITY, 3) INCREASING RAMP CAPACITY AT THE JANTZEN BEACH INTERCHANGE, 4) SIGNALIZING THE UNION AVENUE TO I-5 ON-RAMP INTERSECTION, AND 5) METERING THE NORTHBOUND ON-RAMP AT JANTZEN BEACH.
(FHWA-OR-EIS-79-07-D)
(EIS ORDER # 90630)

DRAFT DATE

I-27, LOOP 289 NORTH TO LOOP 289 SOUTH, EXTENSION 06/18

TEXAS
COUNTY: LUBBOCK

PROPOSED IS THE EXTENSION OF I-27 FROM LOOP 289 NORTH, ACROSS THE CITY OF LUBBOCK, TO LOOP 289 SOUTH, LUBBOCK COUNTY, TEXAS. THE FACILITY IS PROPOSED TO BE A SIX-LANE FREEWAY WITH MAXIMUM UTILIZATION OF FRONTAGE ROADS. THE LENGTH OF THE PROJECT IS APPROXIMATELY 6.3 MILES WHICH MAY VARY WITH THE ALTERNATIVE CHOSEN. THE EXTENSION REQUIRES A RIGHT-OF-WAY OF 400 FEET, WITH ADDITIONAL WIDTH REQUIRED AT INTERSECTIONS. THREE ALTERNATIVE ROUTES ARE CONSIDERED.
(FHWA-TEX-EIS-79-01-D)
(EIS ORDER # 90600)

FINAL DATE

I-95/MA-128 INTERCHANGE AND MA-128 IMPROVEMENTS 06/14

MASSACHUSETTS
COUNTY: ESSEX

PROPOSED IS A HIGHWAY PROJECT IN THE CITY OF PEABODY, ESSEX COUNTY, MASSACHUSETTS. THE ACTIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION IN THIS PROJECT ARE: 1) COMPLETING I-95 FROM FOREST STREET TO ROUTE 128; 2) RELOCATING AND IMPROVING ROUTE 128 FROM US 1 TO ROUTE 114 (ANDOVER STREET); AND 3) AN INTERCHANGE BETWEEN THE NEW I-95 AND THE IMPROVED 128. THE PROPOSED I-95 FROM THE ROUTE 1 ACCESS RAMPS TO ROUTE 128, ABOUT A HALF MILE LONG, WILL BE A MULTI-LANE DIVIDED FACILITY. THE PROPOSED ROUTE 128 IMPROVEMENT WILL BE EIGHT LANES SEPARATED BY A MEDIAN AND ABOUT 4.5 MILES IN LENGTH.
(FHWA-MASS-EIS-74-04-F)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA DOT DOI EPA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90587)

NORTH CAMP CREEK PARKWAY EXTENSION 06/26

GEORGIA
COUNTY: FULTON DOUGLAS

THIS PROPOSED ACTION CONCERNS THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE NORTH CAMP CREEK PARKWAY EXTENSION WHICH WILL BEGIN AT THE INTERSECTION OF BUTNER ROAD AND THE EXISTING CAMP CREEK PARKWAY IN FULTON COUNTY AND WILL EXTEND TO LOWER RIVER ROAD IN DOUGLAS COUNTY, GEORGIA. FEATURES OF THE PROJECT INCLUDE A FOUR-LANE, CONTROLLED ACCESS PARKWAY EXTENSION OF APPROXIMATELY 5.7 MILES IN LENGTH. IN ADDITION TO A NO-BUILD ALTERNATIVE, THREE OTHERS ARE CONSIDERED.
(FHWA-GA-EIS-78-02-F)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA DOI DOT COE EPA FERC HEW
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90634)

FINAL DATE

I-93 & US 1 INTERCHANGE, BOSTON & CAMBRIDGE 06/19

MASSACHUSETTS
COUNTY: SUFFOLK
PROPOSED IS THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE I-93/US 1 INTERCHANGE LOCATED IN THE CHARLESTON SECTION OF THE CITY OF BOSTON, SUFFOLK COUNTY, MASSACHUSETTS. IMPROVEMENTS WILL INCLUDE STRAIGHTENING THE S-CURVE AT THE FOOT OF THE MYSTIC BRIDGE, CONSTRUCTION OF TWO TUNNELS UNDER CITY SQUARE, TWO NEW LOOP RAMPS TO CONNECT TO I-93, REMOVING EXISTING ELEVATED EXPRESSWAY RAMPS OVER CITY SQUARE, AND IMPROVING VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION IN CITY SQUARE AND ADJACENT SURFACE STREETS. THREE ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED.
(FHWA-MASS-EIS-77-01-F)

COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI DOC DOT COE EPA HUD USDA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90604)

US 73/75 IMPROVEMENT, NEBRASKA CITY TO OMAHA 06/11

NEBRASKA
COUNTY: SEVERAL
PROPOSED IS THE IMPROVEMENT OF APPROXIMATELY 46 MILES OF US 73/75 IN THE COUNTIES OF OTOE, CASS, SARPY, AND DOUGLAS, NEBRASKA. THE PROJECT BEGINS SOUTH OF NEBRASKA CITY AND PROCEEDS NORTHERLY, GENERALLY PARALLELING EXISTING US 73/75, TO THE VICINITY OF THE INTERSECTION OF "W" STREET AND RAILROAD AVENUE, OMAHA. THE NEBRASKA CITY WEST BYPASS SEGMENT OF US 73/75 WILL BE ON NEW LOCATION FROM APPROXIMATELY 3 1/2 MILES NORTHWEST OF NEBRASKA CITY TO SOUTH OF NEBRASKA CITY. THE NEBRASKA CITY SOUTH BYPASS (PROPOSED NB-2) WILL BEGIN AT AN INTERSECTION OF US 73/75 AND TERMINATES AT THE MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE AT NEBRASKA CITY.
(FHWA-NEB.-EIS-73-11-F)
COMMENTS MADE BY: COE EPA USDA DOI DOT
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90577)

PINE TO TRADE STREET, FRONT STREET BYPASS, SALEM 06/07

OREGON
COUNTY: MARION
THE PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS TO DIVERT THROUGH TRAFFIC AROUND THE SALEM CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT BY BUILDING CONNECTIONS AT FERRY AND TRADE STREETS AND DIVISION STREET TO FRONT STREET; INCREASING THE CAPACITY OF FRONT STREET BY RELOCATING EXISTING RAILROAD TRACKS AND

WIDENING TO SIX LANES AND MAKING TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENTS ON ONE OR MORE OF THE ALTERNATIVES NORTH OF DIVISION STREET. THIS PROJECT IS LOCATED IN THE CITY OF SALEM, MARION COUNTY, OREGON.

(FHWA-OR-EIS-78-06-F)

COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA COE DOT DOE DOI
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS

(EIS ORDER # 90568)

FINAL DATE

US 15 RELOCATION, US 220 TO PA-14 06/25

PENNSYLVANIA

COUNTY: LYCOMING

PROPOSED IS THE RELOCATION OF US 15 BETWEEN 220 IN WILLIAMSPORT AND PA-14 IN THE VILLAGE OF TROUT RUN WITHIN THE COUNTY OF LYCOMING, PENNSYLVANIA. THE PURPOSE OF THE RELOCATION IS TO REPLACE 10.8 MILES OF EXISTING US 15 WITH AN 11 MILE FOUR-LANE LIMITED ACCESS HIGHWAY. THE PROJECT AREA IS DIVIDED INTO FOUR SEGMENTS. WITHIN THE SOUTH, MIDDLE AND NORTH SEGMENTS SEVERAL ROUTE ALTERNATIVES WERE STUDIED FOR EACH. IN THE CITY SEGMENT CONSTRUCTION OF RELOCATED US 15 AND THE RAMPS WHICH CONNECT IT TO US 220 HAVE BEEN COMPLETED.

(FHWA-PA-EIS-74-03-F)

COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA DOI EPA COE DOC
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES

(EIS ORDER # 90631)

FINAL SUPPLEMENT DATE

I-393 INTERCHANGE, FORT EDDY ROAD, CONCORD 06/05

NEW HAMPSHIRE

COUNTY: MERRIMACK

THIS STATEMENT SUPPLEMENTS FINAL EIS, #40844, FILED 5-21-74 CONCERNING A PROPOSED INTERCHANGE ON I-393 (FORMALLY DESIGNATED AS RELOCATED US-4, US-202, AND NH-9) IN CONCORD CITY, MERRIMACK COUNTY, NEW HAMPSHIRE. THE RECOMMENDED LOCATION IS AT RELOCATED FORT EDDY ROAD. THE PROPOSED INTERCHANGE IS A PARTIAL CLOVERLEAF FACILITY WHICH WILL SERVICE BOTH EAST AND WESTBOUND TRAFFIC TO AND FROM THE BYPASS. THIS INTERCHANGE WILL RELIEVE TRAFFIC CONGESTION AT THE FORT EDDY ROAD BRIDGE STREET INTERSECTION AND PROVIDE AN ALTERNATE ROUTE FOR COMMERCIAL TRAFFIC.

(FHWA-NH-EIS-73-01-FS)

(EIS ORDER # 90559)

FINAL SUPPLEMENT DATE

US 43, SUNFLOWER TO LEROY 06/14

ALABAMA
COUNTY: WASHINGTON

THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS TO IMPROVE THE EXISTING TWO LANE US 43 TO FOUR LANES FROM SUNFLOWER NORTH TO LEROY, ALABAMA IN WASHINGTON COUNTY. BASICALLY, THE PROPOSAL IS TO UTILIZE THE EXISTING ROAD BED FOR TWO LANES OF TRAFFIC AND CONSTRUCT TWO NEW LANES GENERALLY PARALLEL TO COMPLETE THE FOUR LANE FACILITY. ADDITIONAL RIGHT-OF-WAY REQUIRED WILL VARY HOWEVER, BASICALLY IT WILL BE 32 FEET ADDITIONAL ON THE WEST SIDE AND 118 FEET ADDITIONAL ON THE EAST SIDE FOR A TOTAL OF 150 FEET. THE EXISTING RIGHT-OF-WAY WILL BE INCREASED TO A TOTAL OF 250 FEET MINIMUM. THE TOTAL LENGTH OF THE PROJECT IS 11 MILES. THIS STATEMENT SUPPLEMENTS FINAL EIS, #41330, FILED 8-22-74. (FHWA-ALA-EIS-71-60-(FS))

COMMENTS MADE BY: CUE DOI HEW HUD DOT USDA EPA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES

(EIS ORDER # 90593)

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

DRAFT DATE

TRANSIT SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS, LOS ANGELES 06/01

CALIFORNIA
COUNTY: LOS ANGELES

PROPOSED ARE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE LOS ANGELES REGIONAL CORE TRANSIT SYSTEM IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. IN ADDITION TO NO BUILD, IMPROVEMENTS WHICH ARE CONSIDERED FALL INTO TWO CATEGORIES OF FIVE ALTERNATIVES EACH. THE FIRST CATEGORY, RAPID RAIL, CONSISTS OF ALTERNATIVES FOR A LINE-HAUL RAIL RAPID TRANSIT FACILITY SUPPLEMENTED BY A NETWORK OF FEEDER BUSES. THE SECOND CATEGORY, ALL BUS, CONSISTS OF LINE HAUL AND FEEDER BUSES, HAS ALTERNATIVES RANGING FROM AN EXCLUSIVE GRADE SEPARATED AERIAL TO SIMPLE INCREMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS.

(EIS ORDER # 90553)

FINAL DATE

LEXINGTON MARKET STATION JOINT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT 06/29

MARYLAND
COUNTY: BALTIMORE

PROPOSED IS A JOINT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT AT THE DOWNTOWN RETAIL DISTRICT, BALTIMORE CITY AND COUNTY, MARYLAND. PUBLIC SECTOR FUNDS WOULD BE USED FOR REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION; BUSINESS RELOCATION; DEMOLITION; SITE PREPARATION; PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS; THE DISPOSITION OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS TO

DESIGNATED PORTIONS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT SITE AREA, BY SALE OR LEASE, TO PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT ENTITIES AT THE HIGHEST OBTAINABLE PRICE AS ESTABLISHED BY PROFESSIONAL RE-USE APPRAISALS; HISTORIC PRESERVATION COSTS; AND A TWO-BLOCK EXTENSION OF THE CITY'S LEXINGTON STREET MALL.

COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA DOI EPA DOT
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS, INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES

(EIS ORDER # 90657)

U.S.COAST GUARD

DRAFT		DATE
	TANK BARGES DESIGN STANDARDS/POLLUTION PREVENTION	06/15

REGULATORY

PROPOSED ARE REGULATIONS CONCERNING DESIGN STANDARDS FOR ALL NEW TANK BARGES AND REGULATORY ACTION FOR EXISTING TANK BARGES TO REDUCE OIL POLLUTION DUE TO ACCIDENTAL HULL DAMAGE. THE REGULATIONS WOULD REQUIRE THAT ALL NEW TANK BARGES CONSTRUCTED OR CONVERTED TO CARRY OIL UNDER A CONTRACT AWARDED AFTER DECEMBER 31, 1979, BE DOUBLE HULLED WITH THE SEPARATION BETWEEN INNER AND OUTER HULLS A MINIMUM OF 24 INCHES. EXISTING TANK BARGES WITH SINGLE HULLS, MORE THAN 20 YEARS OLD, WILL NOT BE CERTIFIED FOR OIL SERVICE AFTER DECEMBER 31, 1985. EXEMPTIONS WILL BE GRANTED IN SOME CASES.

(EIS ORDER # 90596)

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

CONTACT: MR. WILLARD SITLER
DIRECTOR, ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS OFFICE (66)
VETERANS ADMINISTRATION
810 VERMONT AVENUE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20420
(202) 389-2526

DRAFT DATE

VA MEDICAL CENTER, HOSPITAL REPLACEMENT, PORTLAND 06/01

OREGON
COUNTY: MULTNOMAH
PROPOSED IS THE CONSTRUCTION OF A REPLACEMENT HOSPITAL FOR THE VA MEDICAL CENTER LOCATED IN PORTLAND, MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON. THE PLAN IS TO CONSTRUCT A NEW 600-BED FACILITY EITHER AT THE EXISTING SITE ADJACENT TO A UNIVERSITY MEDICAL SCHOOL OR AT A NEARBY SITE ADJACENT TO A PRIVATE HOSPITAL. THE PROPOSED EXPANSION WOULD DOUBLE THE SIZE OF THE EXISTING FACILITY AND INCREASE THE NUMBER OF BEDS TO 600. THE SITES CONSIDERED ARE AT MARQUAM HILL OR ADJACENT TO EMANUEL HILL.
(EIS ORDER # 90552)

FINAL DATE

NATIONAL CEMETERY, INDIANTOWN GAP 06/07

PENNSYLVANIA
COUNTY: LEBANON
THIS ACTION PROPOSES THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 675 ACRE NATIONAL CEMETERY TO BE LOCATED ON LAND ON THE SOUTH PERIMETER OF THE FORT INDIANTOWN GAP MILITARY RESERVATION IN LEBANON COUNTY, 22 MILES NORTHEAST OF HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA. THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WILL INCLUDE SPACE FOR APPROXIMATELY 313,000 GRAVESITES, AN ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, MAINTENANCE COMPLEX, MEMORIAL CENTER, COMMITAL SERVICE BUILDINGS AND OTHER ASSOCIATED CEMETERY FACILITIES. THE PROPOSED NATIONAL CEMETERY WILL BE AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE NATIONAL CEMETERY SYSTEM AND WILL PROVIDE BURIAL BENEFITS FOR APPROXIMATELY 1,500,000 VETERANS LIVING WITHIN THE SERVICE RANGE OF THE FACILITY.
COMMENTS MADE BY: COE USA USDA VA DOI USN EPA DOT
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90567)

ANNUAL SUMMARY OF 102 STATEMENTS FILED THROUGH JUNE, 1979

(By Agency)

Agency	Draft EIS's filed during 1979	Final EIS's filed during 1979	Suppl. filed during 1979	Total Actions on which Draft or Final State have been rec.
Agriculture, Department of	35	57	5	97
Appalachian Regional Commission				
Architect of the Capitol				
Canal Zone Government				
Civil Aeronautics Board	1	2	0	3
Commerce, Department of	15	8	9	32
Consumer Product Safety Comm.				
Defense, Department of				
Air Force	2	1	2	5
Army	6	3	0	9
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	40	41	22	103
Navy	2	1	0	3
Delaware River Basin Comm.				
Energy, Department of	3	4	2	9
Energy Policy Office				
Energy Research & Devel. Admin.				
Environmental Protection Agency	24	17	1	42
Federal Energy Administration				
Federal Maritime Commission	0	1	0	1
Federal Energy Regulatory Comm.	0	1	0	1
Federal Trade Commission				
General Services Administration	3	4	0	7
t Lakes Basin Commission	0	1	0	1
, Department of				
HUD, Department of	38	53	2	93
Interior, Department of	33	23	5	61
International Boundary and Water Comm. -- U.S. and Mexico				
Interstate Commerce Commission	1	0	0	1
Justice, Department of	1	0	1	2
Labor, Department of				
Nat'l. Aeronautics & Space Admin.	1	0	0	1
Nat'l. Capitol Planning Comm.	0	0	2	2
Nat'l. Science Foundation				
New England River Basins Comm.	1	0	0	1
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	7	6	3	16
Office of Science Technology				
Ohio River Basin Commission	0	2	0	2
Pacific Northwest River Basins Comm.				
Pennsylvania Ave. Devel. Corporation	0	0	1	1
Souris-Red-Rainy River Basins Comm.				
State Department	2	2	0	4
Tennessee Valley Authority	4	1	0	5
Transportation, Department of	58	54	9	121
Treasury, Department of				
Upper Mississippi River Basin Comm.				
U.S. Postal Service	1	0	0	1
U.S. Water Resources Council				
rans Administration	9	3	0	12
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION	1	0	0	1
TOTALS	288	285	64	637

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

102 MONITOR

The 102 Monitor is a monthly publication of the Environmental Protection Agency. In addition to its listing of Environmental Impact Statements which have been filed under the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Monitor contains a list of EPA's comments, filed under the provisions of Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended; items of current concern in NEPA case law; information on the environmental studies of the Council on Environmental Quality; and other matters of interest.

The 102 Monitor is printed and distributed by the Government Printing Office. The subscription rate for the Monitor is $20.00 annually, with an additional $5.00 charge for foreign mailing; individual copies of the Monitor are $1.70 domestic and $2.15 foreign and are available from GPO.

Superintendent of Documents
Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

(Difficulties in obtaining copies of the 102 Monitor should be referred to GPO's Service Section, P.O. Box SSOS, Washington, D.C. 20402.)

Prices revised May, 1978

CHANGE OF ADDRESS FORM

NAME—FIRST, LAST

COMPANY NAME OR ADDITIONAL ADDRESS LINE

STREET ADDRESS

CITY | STATE | ZIP CODE

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE

(or) COUNTRY

Mail this form to: NEW ADDRESS

Superintendent of Documents
Government Printing Office SSOM
Washington, D.C. 20402

Attach last subscription label here.

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER FORM

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER FORM

ENTER MY SUBSCRIPTION TO: 102 MONITOR (MNT)

@ $20.00 Domestic; @ $25.00 Foreign

NAME—FIRST, LAST

COMPANY NAME OR ADDITIONAL ADDRESS LINE

STREET ADDRESS

CITY | STATE | ZIP CODE

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE

(or) COUNTRY

☐ Remittance Enclosed (Make checks payable to Superintendent of Documents)

☐ Charge to my Deposit Account No. ....

MAIL ORDER FORM TO:
Superintendent of Documents
Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402